VOL. XLII., No. 16.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 19, 1898.

*** The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

Contents.

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Solicitors' Journal.

Anglo-Continental Corporation of Western Australia (Lim.), Re 270
Barnes v. Youngs 269
Duthy and Jesson's Contract, Re 269
In the Matter of an Action of Dunmore v. Wharam in the Court of Chancery of the County Palatine of Lancaster 270
John Jones (Deceased), Re. Richards v. Jones 269
Lower Rhine and Wurtemberg Insurance Association v. Sedgwick 270

In the Weekly Reporter.

Ajello v. Worsley 245
Attorney-General v. Earl Grey 251
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Basic Chemical Works, Bindschedler 255
Castell & Brown (Limited), In re. Ex parte Union Bank of London 248
"Chioggia," The 253
Deutsche National Bank v. Paul 243
Marks v. Frogley 249
Pegge v. Neath District Tramways Co. 243
Reg. v. Thornton and Another (Justices). Ex parte Lacon & Co. 241
Sweeting, In re 242
White, In re. Pennell v. Franklin 247

CURRENT TOPICS.

WE HAVE an inquiry from esteemed correspondents as to the names of the committee appointed to frame the rules under the Land Transfer Act, 1897. We supposed that its constitution was tolerably well known; but it may be well to state that it consists of Mr. Justice NORTH, who was appointed by the judges of the Chancery Division; Sir HOWARD ELPHINSTONE, who was appointed by the Council of the Bar; Mr. B. G. LAKE, who was appointed by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society; Mr. J. W. CLARK, Legal Adviser to the Board of Agriculture, who was appointed by that Board; and Mr. R. H. HOLT, the Registrar of the Land Registry.

THE DIE is now cast, and on the 1st of July next the solicitors of London will be face to face with compulsory registration of title. As was generally anticipated, the London County Council at their meeting on Tuesday refused to veto the application to London of the Land Transfer Act, 1897; passing a feeble resolution "that the Privy Council be informed that the London County Council relies on the Order applying the Land Transfer Act, 1897, to London being so framed that it shall be made to take effect according to the letter from the clerk of the Privy Council of the 18th of January, 1898." As that letter specified no periods for the "taking effect progressively" of the Act, it would be "according to the letter" if the Act were applied to one-fourth of the county on the 1st of July, to another one-fourth on the 1st of August, and so on. It is safe to predict that the Act will be applied exactly as may suit the convenience of the Land Registry Office. We print elsewhere a full report of the discussion, and we desire to draw the special attention of solicitors who entertain the notion that the result of the Act will be to increase solicitors' remuneration to the observations made by Mr. SHAW-LEFEVRE. He is not likely to have touched the subject of solicitor's costs without having been "coached" upon it by the Land Registry. He said that it was "a pure delusion" to suppose that landowners would be compelled to employ lawyers; it would be found perfectly possible to register even an absolute title without the intervention of a lawyer. "He did not pretend that the Act would not

interfere with the lawyers' profits." That is, at all events, a straightforward statement of the objects of the Act, and it accords with what we have maintained ever since the controversy commenced.

MEANWHILE the Corporation of the City of London have declined the invitation of the spider to step into its little parlour. It is stated that the corporation had communicated with the Incorporated Law Society, the London Chamber of Commerce, the Surveyors' Institution, the Institute of Bankers, the Auctioneers' Institute, and the Royal Institute of British Architects, and with leading firms of conveyancing solicitors and land agents and surveyors practising in the City, asking for their opinion as to whether it was expedient in the public interest that the Act should be applied to the City. Thirty-six replies had been received, three being in favour of the Act being applied and thirty-three opposed to it. Unlike the London County Council, the corporation have followed the advice for which they asked. The exceptional value of property in the city and the magnitude of the pecuniary interests involved appeared to the corporation to render it undesirable that the Act should be applied to the City in the interests of owners of property. The Act, they thought, should be first applied to some portion of a county where the volume and importance of conveyancing were less than in the City, and where there would be less disturbance or prejudice to owners. The corporation therefore considered that the Act should not be applied to the county of London or the city, and they communicated this opinion both to the Lord Chancellor and the London County Council.

IT IS always interesting to see a novel point of law worked out upon principle, especially when the principle is stated and applied so clearly, if we may be allowed to say so, as was done by KEKEWICH, J., in the recent case of *Re de Nicols* (*ante*, p. 252). Two persons who were both domiciled in France were married in Paris in 1854. They were, under the French law, capable of making any disposition they chose by way of marriage settlement of the property then existing or thereafter to be acquired by them, but in the absence of such special settlement they became subject to the French law of community. Under this the goods forming the common property include all the personal property which the husband and wife own at the time of the marriage, and all personal property coming to them during the marriage, unless, in the case of donation, the donor has provided differently. During the marriage the husband has the sole management of the common property, and when the coverture has ceased the property is divided equally between the husband and wife or their representatives. In the present instance the husband was adjudicated a bankrupt in France in 1863, and in the same year he and his wife came to this country and subsequently became naturalized British subjects. In 1897 the husband died, having by a will made in the English form given his residuary real and personal estate, consisting of property acquired in England, to his wife for life. It was claimed, however, on the part of the wife, that the property thus acquired was subject to the French law of community, and that she was entitled to one-half of it absolutely. The point is by no means free from difficulty, but it seems to depend upon whether the marriage of the parties without an express settlement was equivalent to a contract that all property then existing or afterwards acquired was to be held under the French law applicable in the absence of a settlement. KEKEWICH, J., held that it was, and that the contract was not affected by the subsequent change of domicil. In the case of an English marriage it seems pretty clear that the absence of a settlement does not amount to a contract between the parties to hold property in any particular manner. They take such interests as the law for the time being provides and their interests vary with a change of the law or a change of domicil. But the French law of community is in itself a form of settlement, and the omission of the parties to adopt any of the other forms of settlement may well be taken to be in pursuance of a contract that their rights shall be governed by the common form. In *Re de Nicols*, consequently, there was a contract giving the wife one-half of the property of the husband, and since nothing had occurred to vary the contract, that half was outside the husband's will and went to the wife absolutely.

A TRIAL for manslaughter of an unusual kind took place this week before HAWKINS, J., at the Leicester Assizes, and the case is one of the greatest importance to football players. The facts may be stated very shortly. The accused, in playing a game of football under the Association Rules, charged the deceased from behind and threw him violently forward against the knee of another player who was in the act of kicking the ball. The deceased was seriously injured internally and died in consequence. Charging from behind is against the rules of the game. The judge, however, would not allow the rules to be put in evidence, and held that they were quite irrelevant, and that it did not matter whether the prisoner had broken the rules or not. There seems to be only one other case of the sort reported, and that was also tried at Leicester before BRAMWELL, L.J., in 1878. In that case (*Reg.* v. *Bradshaw*, 14 Cox 83) the judge gave directions to the jury very similar to those given by HAWKINS, J. He said: "No rules or practice of any game whatever can make that lawful which is unlawful by the law of the land; and the law of the land says you shall not do that which is likely to cause the death of another. . . . . Therefore in one way you need not concern yourselves with the rules of football. But, on the other hand, if a man is playing according to the rules and practice of the game, and not going beyond it, it may be reasonable to infer that he is not actuated by any malicious motive or intention, and that he is not acting in a manner which he knows will be likely to be productive of death or injury. But independently of the rules, if the prisoner intended to cause serious hurt to the deceased, or if he knew that in charging as he did he might produce serious injury, and was indifferent and reckless as to whether he would produce serious injury or not, then the act would be unlawful." HAWKINS, J., told the jury that the only question for them was whether the deceased came by his death as the result of gross negligence, or intentional violence on the part of the prisoner. If they thought he had come by his death from any such cause, they should convict. They accordingly did convict. It is submitted, however, that, although the rules are immaterial to the question of "guilty" or "not guilty," anything should be admitted in evidence which affects the degree of the prisoner's guilt, and from this point of view it may be most important to know whether or not the rules were broken. Lord BRAMWELL seems to have held this opinion. No rules can justify an illegal act; but where a person has acted within rules which regulate the play of thousands of young men every day, it seems reasonable that a presumption in favour of accident should be raised, or, at all events, that there should be a presumption against any intention to hurt.

THE DECISION of BYRNE, J., in *Birmingham Breweries* (*Limited*) v. *Jameson* is instructive with reference to the position of the lessees of "tied" houses. "It certainly is rather a startling thing," said LINDLEY, L.J., in *Clegg* v. *Hands* (38 W. R. 433, 44 Ch. D. 503), "to anybody to be told that when you have agreed to buy beer of a particular brewer, you may find yourself bound to take beer from somebody else"; yet this is a result which will ordinarily follow from a covenant by the lessee to take beer from the lessor or his assigns, whether the word "assigns" is expressly used in the covenant, or is left to be brought in by the interpretation clause. In *Clegg* v. *Hands* the latter form was adopted. In a lease by A. and B., who were brewers at the X. brewery, the lessee covenanted not to sell beer other than such as should have been purchased of the lessors or either of them; and the term "lessors" was defined to include their assigns. A. and B. assigned their business and also the demised premises to C., a brewer carrying on business at the Y. brewery, and the X. brewery was shut up. It was held, upon the construction of the covenant, that the benefit of it was not restricted to assigns carrying on the same brewer's business as the lessors, and that since it was a covenant

running with the land, it was enforceable by C. as the assignee of the reversion. The covenant was held not to be personal, and the term "assigns" being used without qualification, C. was entitled to step into the place of the lessors for all purposes of the covenant. In this respect the case was distinguished from *Doe* v. *Reid* (10 B. & C. 849), where the covenant was with the lessors or their assigns or their successors "in their late or present trade as brewers." In that case it was held that the covenant was not enforceable by an assign both of the brewery and of the demised premises who removed the brewery business to a different place. The words "or their successors in their late or present trade as brewers," COTTON, L.J., observed in *Clegg* v. *Hands*, though not in terms limiting the assigns to assigns in that position, afforded in that case a rule of construction. In the present case before BYRNE, J., the lessor, HOOD, was a member of the firm of HOOD & SONS, brewers, and the lessee covenanted to take beer exclusively from "the lessor or his firm of Messrs. HOOD & SONS, or his or their successors in business"; and it was declared that, where the context allowed, the term "lessor" was to include HOOD, his executors, administrators, and assigns. The lessor assigned the reversion in the demised premises to a company, who assigned to the plaintiffs, but the business of his firm was not assigned, and it continued to be carried on. BYRNE, J., held that the term "assigns" was to be read into the covenant without qualification, and that, as in *Clegg* v. *Hands*, the right to enforce the covenant passed to the assignees. Apparently this is in direct opposition to *Doe* v. *Reid* for, even if "assigns" was not excluded by the context, the term when introduced into the covenant should, according to that case, have been restricted to assigns who were successors in business of the lessor's firm. In fact, however, it would seem that the context of the covenant excluded the interpretation clause, especially as the introduction of two brewery firms into the covenant left it uncertain with which of them the lessee was to deal, a result obviously not contemplated by the parties. But in any case the decision shews that the lessee of a tied house, who wishes to avoid the possibility of having the benefit of the covenant transferred to a different business altogether, should see that the covenant binds him only to take from the original lessors or their successors in the particular business.

IN THE CASE of *Re Duthy and Jesson's Contract* (reported elsewhere) the purchaser of a freehold house agreed in writing to accept the best title the vendors could give. Certain title-deeds of the property had been deposited with his mortgagees by a former owner, but though the debt had been paid off, the deeds in question remained in the possession of the solicitors who had acted for the mortgagees. The vendors' solicitors delivered an abstract which did not contain these deeds or any recital of their contents, and a requisition was made on behalf of the purchaser, to whom the above circumstances were disclosed prior to the contract, to have the deeds in question handed over on completion. The vendors applied to the solicitors who acted for the mortgagees, and they declined to part with the deeds. The vendors thereupon refused to comply with the purchaser's request, and ultimately proceeded against the purchaser under the Vendor and Purchaser Act. ROMER, J., pointed out that the purchaser did not ask to have the deeds in question produced for the verification of, or for information as to, the title, but called upon the vendors to fulfil the ordinary vendor's obligation to hand over on completion all title-deeds in their possession or power. Section 3, sub-section 6, of the Conveyancing Act had therefore no application, that enactment concerning only the expenses of "production and inspection" and not affecting the ordinary right of a purchaser on completion to have the title-deeds handed over to him. This appears to be in conformity with the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Re Johnson and Tustin* (33 W. R. 737, 30 Ch. D. 42), where the point whether a purchaser on an open contract was bound to pay the vendor the expense of abstracting a title-deed not in the vendor's possession was decided against the vendor, and COTTON, L.J., said: "Sub-section 6 . . . is dealing with what is the duty of the parties in their respective positions. It is the duty of every person who sells property to shew a title . . . This sub-section 6 assumes, and does not intend to interfere with the performance of that duty by the vendor, and it is dealing only with the expenses of requisitions made on the footing of the abstract by the purchaser, so far as he requires verification or information as to the title shewn thereby, by the production of deeds or abstracts of or copies of documents which are not in possession of the vendor" (30 Ch. D., pp. 45, 46). ROMER, J., after explaining what would have been the duty of the vendors and the right of the purchaser if the mortgage had not been paid off, and saying that the fact of payment off of the mortgage before completion could not make any difference in the right of the purchaser to have the deeds relating to the security handed over, dealt with the special contract as follows: "The provision that the purchaser is to accept the best title that the vendors can give certainly does not take away the purchaser's right. So far as I can see, no question of title is involved. If the vendors had been unable to obtain the deeds because of some defect of title which, under the contract, they were not bound to cure, different considerations would apply. . . The mere fact that obtaining the deeds for the purpose of handing them over on completion may cause the vendors trouble and expense is no answer to the purchaser." The summons was accordingly dismissed with costs.

MR. CRACKANTHORPE, Q.C., looks forward, we are glad to see, to an early settlement of the question of the re-constitution of the University of London as a teaching university, and in an interesting paper contributed to the February number of the *Law Magazine* he gives some suggestions as to the nature of the teaching which the faculty of law in such a university should afford. That a faculty of law will be included may be taken as certain, but what part the Inns of Court will take in the scheme must depend very much upon themselves. The Council of Legal Education will naturally be looked to for guidance in the constitution of the faculty, and its success will depend upon their recognizing that it is possible to teach usefully and effectively the theoretical as well as the practical side of law. To a considerable extent Mr. CRACKANTHORPE's paper is occupied with an account of the facilities for the teaching of law existing in other countries. The most complete system is to be found in Germany, where the philosophical course is taken by way of introduction to the courses in professional law. The subjects of the former course, or "theoretical law," Mr. CRACKANTHORPE defines as "that which forms a necessary part of a wide, liberal education, and without some knowledge of which a man does not feel perfectly at home in the society of well-educated people." By "professional law" he means such technical knowledge as no layman need blush to be without. Possibly many laymen who regard themselves as well educated would cheerfully confess to ignorance of much that is comprised in the philosophy of law. But it is not worth while to quarrel over terms. In Germany the authorities are as strict in requiring a long course of practical work as in insisting on the previous theoretical training. France has followed suit since the Franco-German war, and for the last quarter of a century she seems to have been remodelling her educational system upon German lines. America is overrun with universities and law schools, and in some of them, as is well known, the teaching of law has reached a high standard. As a result of his comparison, Mr. CRACKANTHORPE puts forward a series of suggestions which aim at the establishment in the teaching university of London, under the auspices of the Inns of Court and the Incorporated Law Society, of a faculty of law for the teaching of both theoretical and professional law, so far as the latter is capable of being taught by lectures and classes; and at the introduction of a probationary system, modelled on the Continental plan, in respect of so much of professional law as can only be learnt by actual contact with business.

THE DECISION of BYRNE, J., in *Lyons & Sons* v. *Wilkins* (*ante*, p. 253) terminates a litigation which has had an important effect upon one branch of trade union law, though its possible developments upon another point have been forestalled by the decision of the House of Lords in *Allen* v. *Flood*. The action was brought by a firm of manufacturers against the officers of

a trade union for an injunction to restrain the defendants from maliciously conspiring to induce persons not to enter into contracts with the plaintiffs. An interlocutory injunction to this effect was granted by NORTH, J., but the Court of Appeal (1896, 1 Ch. 811) preferred to rest the illegality of the conduct alleged against the defendants upon the specific provisions of the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875 (38 & 39 Vict. c. 86). Section 7 (4) provides that every person who, with a view to compel any other person to abstain from doing or to do any act which such other person has a legal right to do or abstain from doing, watches or besets the house where such other person resides or carries on business, shall on conviction be subject to certain penalties; but it is added that attending at or near a house or place in order merely to obtain or communicate information is not a watching or besetting within the meaning of the section. The enactment is sufficiently clear without going into the niceties of the right of one man to interfere, whether maliciously or otherwise, with the contracts, actual or potential, of another; and the Court of Appeal, considering that where an act is declared to be unlawful, the party injured ought not to be restricted to his remedy in a criminal court, granted an interlocutory injunction based carefully upon the words of the section. Upon the trial of the action, BYRNE, J., has found that the allegations of picketing upon which the injunction was based have been borne out by the evidence, and hence it has been made perpetual in the form, practically, in which it was granted by the Court of Appeal. But the claim for an injunction based upon the allegation of malicious conspiracy to prevent the formation of contracts has, in view of the decision in *Allen* v. *Flood*, of course failed.

IN THE case of *Mander* v. *Ridgway*, which recently came before the Queen's Bench Division, a question of some interest to county court suitors was determined. It was there held that there is no right of appeal from the decision of a county court judge as to the sufficiency of a stamp affixed to a document, notwithstanding that a general right of appeal is given by section 120 of the County Courts Act, 1888 (51 & 52 Vict. c. 43), with certain exceptions, of which this is not one. The *ratio decidendi* appears to be that, as in the High Court such a decision would certainly be final (*Blewitt* v. *Tritton*, 41 W. R. 36; 1892, 2 Q. B. 327), therefore it must also be final in the county courts, to which, by section 164 of the County Courts Act, 1888, the general principles of practice in the High Court are applied in any case not expressly provided for by the Act or in pursuance thereof.

THE BUSINESS OF THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

THE recent report of the Legal Procedure Committee of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, adopted by the Council on 21st of January, and the further report of the General Council of the Bar, enforce and supplement the suggestions for the rearrangement of the business of the Queen's Bench Division which were contained in the Bar Council's report of last August. The criticisms which the last-mentioned report made upon the existing arrangements were singularly outspoken. The constitution and procedure of the courts were said to be devoid of order or certainty; the keeping open of an adequate number of courts in London was rendered impossible by the perpetual absence of judges on circuit; and the Divisional Courts were irregular in their sittings and unsatisfactory in their constitution. The result, said the report, was muddle and confusion of a very serious character. The specific reforms which the report urged were that an addition should be made to the number of judges in the Queen's Bench Division, so as to insure that at least six courts should sit continuously in London throughout the legal year for the trial of actions in that division; and that all actions should be grouped in separate lists, each list to be assigned either to a separate judge, as in the Chancery Division, or to a small rota of judges, as in the Probate Division, and as is already done in the Queen's Bench Division in respect of the commercial list. The object to be aimed at in arranging the lists would be to secure, as far as possible, that each action should be dealt with throughout all its stages by the same judge. It was further suggested that until additional judges were appointed the judicial strength necessary for carrying out the changes should be obtained by the free appointment of commissioners to go on circuit.

The Council of the Incorporated Law Society agree generally with the complaints of the existing arrangements made by the Bar Council. They consider that unless some reforms such as those just indicated are made, the regular civil tribunals will continue to be avoided or neglected, and there will be an increasing tendency, not only in commercial business, but in other matters, to resort to arbitration in order to avoid the uncertainty and other difficulties incident to litigation under the existing procedure. The recommendation of the Bar Council which the Incorporated Law Society most strongly support is that for the grouping of actions in separate lists, but they add that no reform will be satisfactory which does not radically attack the difficulties which at present hamper all parties to a cause. Particular stress is laid on the delay and uncertainty as to the date of hearing, and as to the court in which, and the judge before whom, any cause will be tried.

In this connection the Council of the Incorporated Law Society are able to point to the suggestions which ten years ago were made in the joint report of the Bar Committee and themselves, some of which have already borne fruit. These suggestions were the forerunners of the regulations of 1883, providing for the issue of weekly lists, and of the Judges' resolutions of 1894, which attempted to secure the regular sitting of the courts in London, the integrity of the weekly lists, and the publication of the daily list at an early hour in the previous afternoon; and which established the Commercial Court. With respect to the six courts which the Bar Council ask should sit continuously in London, the Council of the Incorporated Law Society are not prepared to fix any particular number. They are convinced that there always is and must be increasing business in London, and that it is essential that adequate measures should be taken to cope with the increase, but the exact extent of the remedy they do not undertake to specify. They demur to the appointment of Commissioners of Assize as being an undesirable way of supplementing the deficiency of the judicial bench. So long as the present circuit system continues, this deficiency will continue, and it is said that an addition to the number of the judges of the Queen's Bench Division is imperatively required.

But the report of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society is not confined to indorsing or qualifying the proposals of the Bar Council. Some important independent suggestions are included in it. It is proposed that an official with practical experience of litigation should be appointed as "Master of the Lists" with the rank of a master of the Supreme Court. It would be the duty of this master to arrange the cause lists of the Queen's Bench Division under the direction of the Lord Chief Justice. In arranging the lists, causes of like character would, it is suggested, be grouped in separate lists, and each group assigned to a separate rota of judges selected for each sittings only, so that the work of each of the judges would, during each sittings, be connected with one or more of the groups into which the causes had been divided. It is further proposed that particular court-rooms should be fixed, in which the trials of each of such groups of causes should be conducted before one or other of the judges appointed on the rota for that group. And finally, the abolition of Divisional Courts is recommended.

The further report of the Bar Council indorses these proposals for the appointment of a master of the lists, for the grouping of causes to be tried in particular courts, and for the abolition of Divisional Courts, and recent occurrences which have unexpectedly withdrawn judges from London to fill vacancies on circuit are made the occasion for renewing the demand for additional judicial strength. The Bar Council again emphatically express their conviction that the present staff of judges of the Queen's Bench Division is not sufficient to meet the contemporaneous demands of London and the circuits, and to provide for the accidents of illness and other contingencies which from time to time remove judges from active work.

It may be anticipated that this joint utterance of the bodies entitled to speak on behalf of the two branches of the profession will receive careful attention from the authorities responsible for

the existing arrangements, but it would be hazardous to assume that the demand for an addition to the judicial bench will be granted. It is much more likely that the necessary relief will come from the abolition of Divisional Courts, and there is no reason why this step should be delayed. The work at present done by Divisional Courts can be apportioned between single judges and the Court of Appeal, and a considerable increase of judicial power would be at once available. The appointment of a master of the lists should not cause difficulty, though we are not sure that in arranging separate lists it is necessary to group together causes of a like nature. It is not desirable to have a special court for the trial of libel actions or of breach of promise cases. Provided some judge, or some one of a rota of judges, is in charge of a particular list, and is ready to take the cases as they come on, there seems to be no advantage in securing that all the cases should be of the same character. The real difficulty of course lies in the necessity for a considerable proportion of the judges to be always spending a fugitive existence on circuit, and no probable reform of the circuit system will obviate the difficulty. It is this which stands in the way of each judge being responsible for his own list and having the control of an action from start to finish, including the fixing of an early and certain date for trial so as to suit the convenience of the parties. Apparently the only way to meet the difficulty is to place the list in charge of a rota of judges as suggested, some one of whom could be relied upon to take the particular case at the appointed day, or as near thereto as possible. It would of course be a great advantage if the Treasury could be got to accede to the demand for an additional judge, but this can only be expected when all other means to secure the needed improvements in the dispatch of business have failed. The immediate points to be aimed at are the abolition of Divisional Courts and the appointment of the master of the lists. Both these objects should be attained in the course of the present year. With this done, and the experience of the Commercial Court as a guide, a great improvement in the arrangement of the business might be anticipated.

THE COMPETENCE OF ACCUSED PERSONS AS WITNESSES.

SIR HERBERT STEPHEN is well known as the leading opponent of the proposal for allowing prisoners to give evidence, and the statement of his views which he has now published* merits careful consideration. He puts his case upon the strong ground of experience, and of experience which the leading supporters of the proposal have had no opportunity of sharing. He is quite untouched by the argument that some twenty or thirty statutes already allow prisoners to testify in their own behalf, and that to avoid the absurdity of making the competency of the prisoner depend upon the form in which his indictment is drawn, it is necessary to make this competency universal. He admits the absurdity, but he would apply a different remedy. He goes for repeal, and not for fresh legislation, and he would abrogate the rule of competency in the cases where it at present exists. He says, truly enough, that it is as easy to draft a Bill repealing the enabling statutes, or rather sections of statutes, as it was to draft the Criminal Evidence Bill, and he hopes that it may ultimately prove easier to pass such a repealing Bill through Parliament.

The point he urges is that the whole case has been altered by the experience of the evidence of prisoners which has been accumulated under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885, an experience which he complains, is almost entirely ignored by the advocates of the change. change. For this silence he gives a plausible reason. No single one of the eminent supporters of the Bill, excluding some of the judges, has, he says, had any continuous practice in courts of assize since 1885, and it is only in those courts since that date that actual practical experience of the competence of prisoners as witnesses has been possible. The appearance of the leading advocates in a criminal court is comparatively rare, and they have no experience worth mentioning of the giving of evidence by prisoners. "The man who understands the subject is the popular and successful junior in the constant habit of defending prisoners—the man who defends as a rule from one to two hundred prisoners in the year, of whom probably twenty or thirty will be competent witnesses, who, when he is not defending prisoners himself, is constantly either prosecuting them or hearing them prosecuted and defended by other people. Of men of this class Sir HERBERT STEPHENS is able to cite a considerable number of names in support of his views, and he calls in aid also the experience which his own official position on the Northern Circuit has given him. On the other hand, for lack of such practical experience, he discounts the testimony in favour of the Bill, which has been given by so many eminent lawyers, including the Attorney-General, Sir EDWARD CLARKE, and Sir GEORGE LEWIS. Of the judges, he admits that some who have had experience of the competence of prisoners, notably Mr. Justice HAWKINS and Mr. Justice MATHEWS, have expressed themselves in favour of the measure; but he states that others are opposed to it. Upon the whole he urges very strongly that the great weight of experienced professional opinion is against allowing witnesses to give evidence.

But if there is this weight of expert opinion against the Bill it is natural to ask upon what specific results of experience is it founded? Sir HERBERT puts his case clearly enough. He claims that the result of allowing prisoners to give evidence is to increase the number of innocent persons who are convicted, a proposition which, if it could be supported, would certainly be enough to give the advocates of the measure pause. The most important part of the book, therefore, is that in which this proposition is defended. The effect of allowing prisoners to give evidence has to be considered in relation to the guilty and to the innocent. In relation to the guilty, Sir HERBERT observes, it is generally admitted that competence to testify is pretty sure in a certain number of cases to lead to the conviction of guilty persons who might otherwise escape; but this is not the ground upon which the competency is advocated. It is pointed out that, according to the criminal statistics for 1894, the proportion of persons tried for indictable offences and convicted is no less than 82 per cent. The admission of prisoners as witnesses could not materially raise this figure, while occasionally it would have the effect of enabling a plausible, but guilty, person to escape. The really important question raised by the proposal to make prisoners competent witnesses is how it will effect the cases of prisoners who are not guilty. As to them Sir HERBERT STEPHEN alleges emphatically that an innocent person is not less but more likely to be convicted if he can be heard as a witness for himself than if he cannot. He repeats a statement he has already made, that on the Northern Circuit three or four innocent persons are, on the average, convicted every year because they have given evidence, when they would have been acquitted if they had been incompetent as witnesses, and he hazards the speculation that if the Criminal Evidence Bill becomes law it will produce the conviction in England every year of three or four hundred innocent persons who, but for it, would be acquitted.

Positive evidence of the truth of this assertion it is in the nature of things impossible to give. All that Sir HERBERT STEPHEN does is to assert the fact and to offer such explanation as he can. "Even," he says, "if there were no assignable reason, I am quite satisfied of the fact, and so are a great many other people who are really in a position to judge by experience." The reasons he assigns are twofold. First, a prisoner who gives evidence in his own behalf does not get the benefit of the doubt; and secondly, even though innocent, he frequently raises a presumption of guilt by giving false explanations of suspicious circumstances. The first point is very ingeniously put. Under the existing system the jury expect the prosecution to prove the prisoner's guilt beyond all reasonable doubt. If the proof does not come up to this standard the prisoner is acquitted. "It is this attitude of mind on the part of juries which is the real safeguard of innocent persons unfortunately—or through deliberate perjury—placed in suspicious circumstances. A large number of prisoners are acquitted solely in consequence of this rule, because, though they are probably guilty, and the jury think they are guilty, their guilt is just not proved with the necessary degree of assurance. Of course the truth is that the great bulk of such persons are guilty, and are undeservedly fortunate in escaping. But a small proportion are not guilty. It may be roughly guessed that something like four or five out of a hundred persons acquitted on this ground are innocent. Juries cannot know by revelation which four or five out of the hundred are innocent, and they secure the acquittal of the four or five in the only possible manner, by acquitting all the hundred." But, continues Sir HERBERT STEPHEN, where prisoners are competent witnesses, and give evidence, the attitude of mind which now guides juries disappears. They no longer call for strict proof against the prisoner, but, taking his evidence with the other evidence before them, they strike a balance of probabilities. As a reason for their so doing it is suggested that when the prisoner's mouth is closed the jury assume that, if he could speak, he would give a clear contradiction to the charge. In other words, they allow him hypothetically the same benefit as though he were a perfectly good witness in his own behalf. "All this is quite changed when the prisoner has given evidence. There is no longer anything imaginary about it. They have heard the assertion of innocence, and very likely it has not impressed them much. There is no need to exact a standard of proof here, and they merely strike the balance." Upon the figures

* Prisoners on Oath: Present and Future. By Sir Herbert Stephen, Bart., Barrister-at-Law, Clerk of Assize for the Northern Circuit. William Heinemann.

stated above the "balance of probabilities is against each one of the hundred, who are all probably guilty—that is, ninety-five of them are guilty—and the jury convict everyone of the hundred, including the five innocent.

The other reason by which Sir HERBERT STEPHEN accounts for the above result is that juries always draw the inference that a prisoner who tells them lies in his evidence is guilty of the crime with which he is charged. The circumstances which have roused suspicion against a prisoner and brought him into the dock may be circumstances of which he has reason to be ashamed, even though he is innocent of the crime charged. He accordingly gives an untruthful answer as to the circumstances, and when the untruth is apparent the jury at once jump to the conclusion that he is guilty of the crime.

The foregoing are the reasons by which Sir HERBERT STEPHEN seeks to account for what, in his belief, experience clearly teaches to be the fact, that a prisoner's own evidence, even when he is innocent, increases the likelihood of his conviction. The statement of the fact he admits to partake largely of the paradoxical, and it is unfortunate that it cannot be made to rest on anything better than somewhat hypothetical reasoning upon the changed attitude of the minds of juries. But our object now is to state the argument and not to criticize it. An interesting chapter is devoted to an examination of the speeches made on behalf of the Criminal Evidence Bill in the House of Commons, when the Bill was read a second time last April. Sir HERBERT STEPHEN does not admit the importance of the instances of hardship under the existing law which were then brought forward, and he finds the speakers wanting in that experience of practice under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885, upon which he bases his own attack on the Bill, As a suggestion for a settlement of the controversy, he proposes that every prisoner, although defended by counsel, should have a right to make—including the right to read—any statement he chooses, at the close of the case for the prosecution, and before any address to the jury by his counsel; but this would not be on oath, and the one thing to be avoided, Sir HERBERT insists, is questioning the prisoner.

REVIEWS.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Conveyancing and Settled Land Acts, and some other Recent Acts affecting Conveyancing, with Commentaries. By H. J. HOOD, M.A., one of the Bankruptcy Registrars of the High Court of Justice, and H. W. CHALLIS, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Fifth Edition. By H. W. CHALLIS, assisted by J. I. STIRLING, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons (Limited); Reeves & Turner. Price 18s.

A Digest of the Law of Agency. By WILLIAM BOWSTEAD, Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

The Law of Arbitration, being the Arbitration Act, 1889, with Notes of Statutes, Rules of Court, Forms and Cases, and an Index. By W. OUTRAM CREWE, Solicitor. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. William Clowes & Sons (Limited).

The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897 (60 & 61 Vict. c. 87), with Copious Notes and an Appendix containing the Employers' Liability Act, 1880 (43 & 44 Vict. c. 42). By W. ADDINGTON WILLIS, LL.B. (Lond.), Barrister-at-Law. Third Edition. With Analysis of a Proposed Scheme to be Certified under the Act, and Form of Application for a certificate. Butterworth & Co.; Shaw & Sons.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE COUNCIL OF THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY AND THE LAND TRANSFER ACT, 1897.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—Whether the Council of the Incorporated Law Society were wise in abandoning last year the opposition they had so long maintained to the Land Transfer Bill, containing as it did the compulsory clauses, is a question on which opinions must differ, but, assuming they were mistaken, it is not fair to lay all the blame for the course adopted on the Council, as is being done by some of your correspondents from Yorkshire.

Before any final decision was come to by the Council, a meeting of the Associated Provincial Law Societies was held, and that meeting endorsed (I think unanimously, but at all events with very few dissentients) the action of the Council. I recollect that at that meeting I seconded (I forget who proposed) a resolution to the effect that it was desirable the opposition to compulsion in any shape should be continued as heretofore; and we withdrew that motion at the instance of some very eminent country members who had been among the most constant and energetic opponents of compulsion, and certainly the Yorkshire representatives did not protest against the course adopted. It must not be forgotten that the influence of the profession, even when completely united, depends upon organization; organization implies leaders, and leaders are useless unless the general body of members follow their lead.

I felt, and I believe my view was the common one, that when we were told by gentlemen of the authority of those I have mentioned that in their opinion the most prudent course for the profession to adopt was to accept a compromise with the Government, we must either accept this advice or pass what would have amounted to a vote of want of confidence in those leaders without whose assistance and manage we should have been helpless.

It is not fair to speak of the action of the Council as implying any approval of the measure; the course adopted was perfectly justifiable if the Council were right in their opinion that it was wise to agree with the enemy while they had an opportunity of so doing, and that further opposition was likely to result in a more mischievous Act than the one with which the Government offered to be content.

I am, on the whole, myself inclined to think that the Council were right, and that the compromise was the lesser of two evils, but that is not the point I at all wish to discuss now; what I do protest against is the attack upon a body to whom the profession owe a deep debt of gratitude for having taken a course which, whether wise or unwise, was adopted by the provincial societies.

I can hardly imagine that the complaints that have been made of the answer given on behalf of the Society to the inquiry of the London County Council are serious. To say nothing of the duty the Society owes to the metropolis, I can conceive nothing more unfortunate in the interests of the country at large than a refusal by the Council of the Society to express an opinion on the convenience and utility of the measure. Had no answer been given to the inquiry, it would have been always open to the Government, when seeking to induce county councils in the provinces to ask for an order under the Act, to suggest that the profession, as represented by the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom, was not opposed to the principle of compulsion, and, in support of this assertion, to point to the absence of any reply in that sense to a question put to the Society by the London County Council. H.

Hereford, Feb. 14.

THE RULES UNDER THE LAND TRANSFER ACT, 1897.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—The 22nd section of this Act enacts that general rules and orders under section 111 of the principal Act shall be made by the Lord Chancellor with the advice and assistance of the registrar, a judge of the Chancery Division of the High Court to be chosen by the judges of that division, and three other persons, one to be chosen by the General Council of the Bar, one by the Board of Agriculture, and one by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society.

The rule-making body, therefore, appears to consist of the Lord Chancellor, a judge, and three other "persons," who may be lawyers or not.

Now (*inter alia*), what does the 111th section of the principal Act of 1875 provide? Why, that rules may be made, rescinded, amended, or added to in respect of "the costs to be charged by solicitors or certificated conveyancers in or incidental to or consequential on the registration of land, or any other matter required to be done for the purpose of carrying this Act into execution, with power to require such costs to be payable by commission, percentage, or otherwise, and to bear a certain proportion to the value of the land registered, or to be determined on such other principle as may be thought expedient, and the taxation of such costs and the persons by whom such costs are to be paid."

It appears clear, therefore, that the Lord Chancellor, prompted by the registrar or assistant registrar, and an unknown judge, and three other "persons" to be appointed, may make almost any rules they please as to solicitors' costs under the Act. Of course counsel's fees are not touched, but the poor solicitor may perhaps even envy the proverbial toad under a harrow.

By the way, Mr. Editor, can you inform us the names of the judge and three other "persons" who are to decide for us behind our backs what costs we ought to charge?

Bristol, Feb. 15. J. M. & S.

[See the names under the head of "Current Topics."—ED. *S.J.*]

INCIDENCE OF SETTLEMENT ESTATE DUTY WHERE TESTATOR DIED BEFORE, BUT THE DUTY NOT PAID TILL AFTER, THE FINANCE ACT, 1896.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—A testator died in May, 1896, having by will settled a share of his residuary trust moneys, the settlement estate duty on which has only now been assessed and paid. Is such duty payable out of the settled fund or out of the residuary estate?

The Finance Act, 1896 (Part 4), commenced on the 1st of July, 1896, and the expression "deceased person" means a person dying after that date (see section 24). Section 19 provides for the incidence of the above duty, making it payable out of the property settled by the will of the "deceased" (not, be it noted, "deceased person").

Some months ago the Controller courteously informed me that, in his opinion, the provisions of section 19 apply to settlement estate duty which, at the time of the Act coming into operation, was unpaid.

Your readers will remember *Re Webber, Gribble* v. *Webber* (40 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, p. 388; and referred to in "Current Topics," p. 645), which was decided before the 1896 Act, and under which settlement estate duty was held to be payable out of the residuary personal estate. That decision would govern my case unless section 19 applies in the way the Controller thought it did, and, having regard especially to the grievance the Act was intended to remedy, I think, if I may presume to say so, that there would be some difficulty in maintaining an opinion contrary to the Controller's. I assume, of course, that the word "deceased" in section 19 does not mean the same as "deceased person" in section 24.

I should be glad to know your opinion, or that of any of your readers, as to the proper incidence of the duty in the above circumstances.

F. G. LING.

Framlingham, Feb. 14.

[Section 19 of the Finance Act, 1896, appears to be retrospective; the words "settled by the will of the deceased" being taken from section 5 (1) of the Act of 1894 and inserted in section 19 by way of description only. In Soward's Handbook of Estate Duty, 2nd ed., p. 96, it is stated that this interpretation is adopted by the Office with regard to all settlement estate duty not assessed prior to the 1st of July, 1896.—ED. *S.J.*]

CASES OF THE WEEK.

High Court—Chancery Division.

Re **DUTHY AND JESSON'S CONTRACT.** Romer, J. 12th Feb.

VENDOR AND PURCHASER—VENDORS' DUTY TO HAND OVER ALL TITLE DEEDS ON COMPLETION—AGREEMENT TO ACCEPT "THE BEST TITLE THE VENDORS CAN GIVE"—DEEDS DEPOSITED WITH MORTGAGEES.

Summons. This was an application under the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874, by Herbert A. Duthy, William R. Duthy, and F. E. Duthy, the vendors of a freehold house, No. 32, Paget-street, Southampton, for a declaration that a good title to the property had been shewn in accordance with the contract for sale dated the 18th of January, 1897. The instrument containing the contract was in the following terms—viz., "Received the 18th day of January, 1897, of Mr. Robert Wm. Jesson the sum of £10 as a deposit and in part payment of the sum of £480 for the purchase of a freehold dwelling-house and premises, No. 32, Paget-street, Southampton. The purchaser to accept the best title the vendors can give. The purchase to be settled on or before the 1st day of February next. The vendors to give the purchasers a bond of indemnity against any claim of George Henry Duthy, who has not been heard of for the past thirty-two years, at their expense. (Signed) Herbert Duthy, William R. Duthy. I agree to purchase on the terms above mentioned, the 18th of January, 1897. (Signed) Robert W. Jesson." It appeared that George Henry Duthy, the elder, purchased the property in 1846. In 1847 he made a post-nuptial settlement of certain moneys in favour of his wife and children, the trust of *corpus* (in default of appointment under certain powers contained in the settlement) being for the children of Mr. and Mrs. Duthy living at the death of the survivor of them in equal shares. In 1848 he mortgaged the property to the trustees of this settlement, of whom there were two, to secure £300 and interest. In 1862, one of these trustees having died, another trustee was appointed in his place, but the mortgage was not transferred to the new trustee, and would seem to have remained vested in the survivor of the original trustees until his death, which took place subsequent to this appointment. The settlor died in 1890, having by his will dated in 1847 in effect directed his estate to be divided amongst all his children on their attaining the age of twenty-one years, and his widow died in 1892. The vendors were the surviving children of the settlor (other than George Henry Duthy). On the 21st of January, 1897, an abstract of title was delivered to the purchaser, commencing with a conveyance dated the 5th of November, 1894, by Wm. R. Duthy and F. E. Duthy of their respective interests in the property to Herbert A. Duthy, but the vendors declined to hand over the earlier title-deeds to the purchaser on the ground that the solicitors who had acted for the mortgagees declined to hand them over, and that the title abstracted was the best title that the vendors could give. The earlier title had been disclosed to the purchaser before the contract was entered into, and he was informed at the same time that the mortgage had been paid off, and that the earlier title-deeds were in the possession of the mortgagees' solicitors.

ROMER, J., said that the purchaser was calling upon the vendors to fulfil the ordinary obligation they were under of handing over on completion all title-deeds in their possession or power. The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881, s. 3, sub-section (6), had therefore no application: see as to the limited operation of that sub-section *Re Johnson and Tustin* (33 W. R. 737, 30 Ch. D. 42, at p. 46). The deeds in question here were deposited with certain mortgagees whose debt had since been paid off. If the debt had not been paid off, the vendors would have been bound on completion to obtain the concurrence of the mortgagees in the conveyance to the purchaser, and the deeds would then have been handed over. And the mere fact that the debt had been previously paid off could make no difference in the right of the purchaser to have the deeds handed over. Nor would the provision in the contract that the purchaser was to accept the best title that the vendors could give take away the purchaser's right. No question of title was involved. The mere fact that obtaining the deeds might cause the vendors trouble and expense was no answer to the purchaser. The vendors had applied to the solicitors who acted for the mortgagees. The deeds did not belong to those solicitors, and they could not part with the deeds without the authority of the mortgagees or their representatives. So far as his lordship could ascertain no endeavour had been made by the vendors to obtain such authority to the solicitors. On the materials before the court the vendors were not now in a position to call upon the purchaser to waive his claim to have the deeds handed over on completion, and the summons must therefore be dismissed with costs.—COUNSEL, *Farwell*, Q.C., and *Mark Romer*; *Neville*, Q.C., and *Sargant*. SOLICITORS, *Rowcliffes, Rawle, & Co.*, for *Cousins & Burbridge*, Portsmouth; *Barlow & Barlow*, for *Stanton, Bassett, & Stanton*, Southampton.

[Reported by J. F. WALEY, Barrister-at-Law.]

BARNES *v.* YOUNGS. Romer, J. 4th Feb.

ARBITRATION — PARTNERSHIP — NOTICE OF EXPULSION — QUASI-JUDICIAL POSITION OF CO-PARTNERS.

Motion. This was a motion to stay proceedings and refer to arbitration made on behalf of the defendants in the action. The action had been brought by a partner against his co-partners for a declaration that a notice of expulsion from the partnership served on him by them was void, and for an injunction to restrain the defendants from publishing notice of dissolution of the partnership. The facts shortly were as follow: By paragraph 31 of the articles of partnership it was in effect provided that a power of expulsion by notice in writing was given against any partner who might *inter alia* be guilty of conduct detrimental to the partnership business. It was further provided that if any question should arise as to whether events had happened to authorize the exercise of this power, the same should be referred to arbitration. By paragraph 37 of the articles it was *inter alia* provided that any dispute or question between the parties touching the partnership or the dissolution thereof or the rights and liabilities of the partners under the articles should be referred to two arbitrators or their umpire pursuant to the Arbitration Act, 1889, or any statutory modification or re-enactment for the time being in force. Certain conduct of the plaintiff having been brought to the knowledge of the defendants, his co-partners, they without any warning, and without giving him an opportunity of explanation, served notice of expulsion on him as having committed a breach of the provisions of clause 31 giving a power of expulsion. Upon the plaintiff bringing a motion in his action to restrain the defendants from publishing notice of dissolution, it was directed to stand over, and in the meantime the defendants served the plaintiff with notice of this present motion to stay proceedings in the action and refer the matter to arbitration as provided for by the articles. It was contended on behalf of the plaintiff, the respondent to this motion, that the notice was void on the ground that he had been given no opportunity of explaining his conduct, that the notice had not been given *bonâ fide*, and that such questions were not adapted to be referred to arbitration. Reference particularly was made to *Blissit* v. *Daniel* (10 Hare 493), *Wood* v. *Wood* (L. R. 9 Ex. 190), *Lyon* v. *Johnson* (40 Ch. D. 579), *Re Carlisle* (44 Ch. D. 200), *Wallis* v. *Hirsch* (1 C. B. N. S. 316), *Russell* v. *Russell* (14 Ch. D. 471).

ROMER, J., said that in his opinion the notice of expulsion was void on the ground that no opportunity had been given to the respondent of explaining his conduct. That persons in the position of co-partners with a power under certain conditions of giving a notice of expulsion were in a quasi-judicial position with regard to the exercise of this power, and therefore should give the other partner an opportunity of giving any explanation he might have to offer. Under the circumstances the question whether the notice of expulsion was valid or not was, in his opinion, not one adapted to be referred to arbitration. His lordship, further, was of opinion that the allegation of the plaintiff that the notice was not given *bonâ fide* amounted to a charge of fraud against the defendants, his co-partners, and this was also a reason against referring the matter to arbitration. On these grounds no order was made on the motion to refer.—COUNSEL, *Neville*, Q.C., and *Micklem*; *Levett*, Q.C., and *T. Watson*. SOLICITORS, *Crowder, Vizard, & Co.*; *Collyer, Bristow, & Co.*

[Reported by RALEGH B. PHILLPOTTS, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re **JOHN JONES (Deceased), RICHARDS *v.* JONES.** Byrne, J. 12th Feb.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—GIFT OVER AFTER ABSOLUTE INTEREST—REPUGNANCY.

Summons. John Jones, of Penmaenmawr, Carnarvonshire, by his will dated the 19th of April, 1893, gave, devised, and bequeathed all his real and personal estate, of whatsoever kind, unto his wife, Jane Jones, for her absolute use and benefit, so that during her lifetime, for the purpose of her maintenance and support, she should have the fullest power to sell and dispose of his real estate absolutely; and the will continued: "After her death as to such parts of my real and personal estate as she shall not have disposed of as aforesaid, subject to the payment of my wife's funeral

expenses, I give, devise, and bequeath the same unto my brother, Owen Jones, and my wife's sister, Mary Jones, upon trust to sell and convert the same into money, and to divide the capital thereof into five equal shares and portions and to pay such shares or portions to the following persons," who were then named. The testator died in 1891. Jane Jones survived the testator, and by her will appointed the defendant her sole executor, and made him her residuary legatee. She died in September, 1897. This summons was taken out by one of the parties entitled under the gift over after the death of Jane Jones for a declaration that she took a life estate only in the testator's real and personal estate, with power of disposition by act *inter vivos* only, for her maintenance and support, and that on her death such parts of the property which she had not disposed of passed under the residuary gift in the will of John Jones.

BRYNE, J., held that the subsequent words in the will of John Jones were not sufficiently clear to reduce the absolute interest previously given to a life estate, and distinguished the case of *Re Pounder* (56 L. J. Ch. 113), on the ground of the revocation of the previous interest by the codicil in that case. Consequently the gift to Jane Jones was absolute, and the subsequent gifts over void.—COUNSEL, *Eve*, Q.C., and *MacConkey; Astbury*, Q.C., *T. R. Hughes*, and *J. A. Price*. SOLICITORS, *Horrocks & Christian Jones*, Liverpool; *Alfred Stephenson*, for *D. Owen & Griffith*, Bangor.

[Reported by N. TEBBUTT, Barrister-at-Law.]

IN THE MATTER OF AN ACTION OF DUNMORE *v.* WHARAM IN THE COURT OF CHANCERY OF THE COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER. Byrne, J. 5th and 12th Feb.

PRACTICE—PALATINE COURT—DEFENDANT OUT OF JURISDICTION—ORDER OF ATTACHMENT—COURT OF CHANCERY OF LANCASTER ACT, 1850, s. 15—COURT OF CHANCERY OF LANCASTER ACT, 1854, s. 7.

Motion. This was an *ex parte* application on behalf of the plaintiff to make an order of the Court of Chancery of the County of Lancaster for leave to issue a writ of attachment an order of the High Court under section 15 of the Court of Chancery of Lancaster Act, 1850 (13 & 14 Vict. c. 43). Judgment was given in the action by the Palatine Court in July, 1897, and the defendants Wharam and Broughton were thereby ordered to pay a sum of £2,275, which represented trust funds under an indenture of settlement, into court within seven days after service of the judgment. The defendants had both appeared to the action. Judgment was served on the defendants but they did not comply with the order. An order was then obtained on the 31st of January, 1898, from the Palatine Court to issue a writ of attachment against the defendant Broughton, who resided at Bishop Auckland, in Durham, out of the jurisdiction of the court. The present application was to make that order an order of the High Court. The only question was whether the application should not have been made under section 7 of the Court of Chancery of Lancaster Act, 1854 (17 & 18 Vict. c. 82), to the Court of Appeal constituted by that Act. This section enables that court of appeal to punish persons in contempt of the Palatine Court when the latter court cannot effectually punish them itself. Counsel contended that that section was only intended to apply where the Palatine Court had no power to make the order at all, and not where, as in this case, they had jurisdiction to make the original order in consequence of the defendant having submitted to the jurisdiction of the court by appearing.

Feb. 12.—BYRNE, J., made order asked for.—COUNSEL, *T. R. Hughes*. SOLICITOR, *A. S. Mather*, Liverpool.

[Reported by N. TEBBUTT, Barrister-at-Law.]

Winding-up Cases.

***Re* ANGLO-CONTINENTAL CORPORATION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA (LIM.).** Wright, J. 2nd and 9th Feb.

COMPANY WINDING UP—SURPLUS ASSETS DISTRIBUTION—ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION—REPAYMENT—UNEQUAL CONTRIBUTION—EQUALIZATION.

Application by the liquidator for the direction of the court as to the distribution of the surplus assets of the company, which he still had in his hands after payment of all debts and expenses. The company had been registered with a capital of £500,000 divided into a similar number of shares of £1 each. Of these, 25,000 shares had been issued and were fully paid up, and 100,000 other shares had been issued with 5s. a share paid up. Clause 129 of the articles of association enacted: "If, upon the winding up of the company, the surplus assets shall be more than sufficient to repay the whole paid-up capital the excess shall be distributed among the members in proportion to the capital paid or which ought to have been paid on the shares held by them respectively at the commencement of the winding up, other than amounts paid in advance of calls. If the surplus assets shall be insufficient to repay the whole of the paid-up capital, such surplus assets shall be distributed so that as nearly as may be the losses shall be borne by the members in proportion to the capital paid, or which ought to have been paid, on the shares held by them respectively at the commencement of the winding up, other than amounts paid in advance of calls. But this clause is to be without prejudice to the rights of holders of shares upon special conditions." The assets now remaining in the hands of the liquidator were not sufficient to repay all the capital which had been paid in full, and the direction of the court was sought as to the distribution of this remaining asset.

WRIGHT, J., held that as clause 129 of the articles of association regulated the distribution of surplus assets in this company, and in consequence there was no room for the application of the principle applied in *Birch* v. *Cropper* (38 W. R. 401, 14 A. C. 525). If there had been a real surplus after returning the paid-up capital it would, by the express terms of the contract, have been divisible not according to the nominal amounts of the shares but according to the amounts which had been paid up and which therefore had presumably had the principal merit in earning the profit. But the adventure had resulted in a loss instead of a profit, there however still remained an equity to be satisfied in order to equalize the loss, and the uncalled capital ought to be called up unless the contract had otherwise provided. It had not otherwise provided. "Capital paid" according to *Ex parte Lowenfeld* (70 L. T. 3), did not mean merely capital paid before the liquidation or called up in the liquidation for payment of debts and expenses, but included that which was called up, or treated as called up, for the purpose of satisfying equities in the repayment of capital. This was really in this case not a surplus but a mitigation of loss. The loss and the mitigation of it were to be distributed equally, but subject to the equalization of the capital account and not irrespective of such equalization, and a call was necessary for that equalisation, the amount of which call would be included in the words "Capital paid or which ought to have been paid." There must therefore be a call made on the 100,000 shares sufficient to equalise the capital amount.—COUNSEL, *Arthur Chitty; A. Beddall; Kirby*. SOLICITORS, *Ridley; Batchelor & Cousins; Ashurst, Morris, Crisp, & Co.*

[Reported by C. W. MEAD, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Queen's Bench Division.

THE LOWER RHINE AND WURTEMBERG INSURANCE ASSOCIATION *v.* SEDGWICK. Com. Court, Kennedy, J. 8th, 10th, and 11th Feb.

INSURANCE, MARINE—UNDERWRITER RE-INSURES PART OF RISK UNDER ORIGINAL POLICY—ORIGINAL POLICY CANCELLED, BUT SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR POLICY IS CONCURRENTLY EFFECTED WITH HIM—TOTAL LOSS—MONEY PAID TO RE-ASSURED BEFORE KNOWLEDGE THAT ORIGINAL POLICY WAS CANCELLED—ACTION TO GET BACK THIS PAYMENT—INSURABLE INTEREST AT THE TIME RISK WAS RE-INSURED.

Commercial cause. The action was brought to recover back money paid by the plaintiffs to the defendant under a mistake of fact, and the sole question for the court was whether the defendant's contention was right, that he was entitled to be paid this amount and could have recovered it from the plaintiffs. The defendant, an underwriter at Lloyd's, subscribed, together with other underwriters, certain policies of marine insurance upon the steamship *Collynie*—namely: (1) A policy running from the 20th of February, 1896, for one year upon hull and machinery of steamer of the total value of £5,600. The amount insured was £350, of which the defendant's "line" was £50, the balance being subscribed by his six other "names"; and (2) a policy running from the 20th June, 1896, for one year containing the same valuation and time provision clauses as the first policy. The amount insured was £850, of which the defendant's "line" was £25, the other "names" taking £150 between them. The time clauses attached to the two original policies provided that "the insured value should be taken as the repaired value in ascertaining whether the vessel was a constructive total loss" with usual conditions. On the 27th of November, 1896, the defendant and his six other "names" effected with the plaintiffs a policy of re-insurance upon *The Collynie* running from the 4th of November, 1896, until the 20th of June, 1897, the valuation of hull and machinery being entered at £5,600. The amount insured was £250. The defendant's original policies were not asked for or shewn to the plaintiffs. The plaintiffs themselves again re-insured under a policy dated the 12th of November, 1896, against total loss only. On the 20th of February, 1897, the first of the original policies expired and the second was cancelled, and their place was taken by a fresh policy of even date running for one year, but the valuation of hull and machinery was reduced to £5,000. The amount insured was £1,040, of which the "line" of the defendant was £50, and of his six other "names" £50 each, or £350 in all. No notice of cancellation and expiration of the first two policies and of the issue of a fresh policy was sent to the plaintiffs. On the 3rd of May, 1897, *The Collynie* became a total loss, and the defendant paid his assured as and for a total loss. The plaintiffs paid the defendant and his other "names" a total loss on the policy of the 27th of November, 1896, without asking for production of original policies. When the plaintiffs sought to recover from their re-insurers, their re-insurers required to be shewn the original policies. The plaintiffs then for the first time became aware of the cancellation of the policy of the 20th of June, 1896, and the substitution for it of the policy of the 20th of February, 1897, and brought this action to recover back the sum they had paid. For the plaintiffs it was contended that the policy of re-insurance could only be effective on an existing policy, as it only covered risks insured by such policy or policies. Moreover, the new policy of February, 1897, on hull and machinery, was for a different sum, and the risk was more onerous. The parties, therefore, were not *ad idem*, and the money paid under mistake of now admitted facts ought to be returned. For the defendant it was argued that as he could shew at the time of the loss that he was interested in the subject-matter of the insurance and that the loss rendered him liable under the conditions of his underwriting agreement he could have recovered from the plaintiffs had they declined to pay him the sum which they now sought to have repaid, and therefore he was entitled to retain it.

KENNEDY, J., in his considered judgment, held that judgment ought to be entered for the defendant. In his opinion it would not have been

possible to frame a good plea in answer to the defendant's claim had the relative position of the parties in the action been reversed. The evidence shewed that the defendant had an insurable interest as an insurer of the subject-matter of the insurance at the time he effected the policy with the plaintiffs. It was not necessary to aver interest at the time the policy was effected. All an insurer had to do was to shew that he possessed an insurable interest at the time he effected the policy of re-insurance when called upon to do so. The defendant had such an interest under the first two policies, and it was not lost by the fact that such interest was increased or diminished somewhat by the time that the loss actually occurred and he himself became liable. In his opinion the interest of the defendant was amply sufficient to have supported an action had the plaintiffs refused to meet his claim for the payment of the sum they had made and now sought to recover back. That seemed to him to decide the question, and judgment would be entered for the defendant with costs.—COUNSEL, *English Harrison*, Q.C., and *Joseph Hurst; Joseph Walton*, Q.C., and *Scrutton*. SOLICITORS, *Pritchard & Sons; Waltons, Johnson, Bubb, & Whatton*.

[Reported by ERSKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

THE APPLICATION OF THE LAND TRANSFER ACT TO LONDON.

(SPECIAL REPORT.)

The subject of the application of the Land Transfer Act was considered at a special meeting of the London County Council held at the County Hall, Spring-gardens, on Tuesday. The chairman, Dr. COLLINS, presided. The attendance of members was distinctly above the average, about 125 being present. The total membership is 137, but two of the seats are vacant.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN (Mr. R. Melvill Beachcroft), as chairman of the General Purposes Committee, moved the adoption of the report of the committee upon the subject. The effect of the report was that since the 25th of January, when the committee last reported on the matter, letters against the Act being applied to London had been received from the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, the Cannon Brewery Co. (Limited), the Freehold and Leasehold Permanent Benefit Building Society, and the Standard Benefit Building Society. Letters had also been received from the vestry of Hackney and the School Board for London stating that those bodies desired to express no opinion on the subject of the Act. The committee had had before them a memorandum from the Corporate Property Committee, pointing out that as the new register will not be open to public inspection, the ground plan of London, which is now in course of preparation by the Council, and which has already proved of considerable use, will not be able to be completed or to be kept up to date, and that its usefulness will therefore be greatly interfered with. The committee thought that the point raised might probably be met by special arrangement with the Land Registry should the Act be applied to London. They also thought it desirable to again refer to the following letter from the Privy Council quoted in their previous report:

"Privy Council Office, Whitehall, 18th January, 1898.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Lord President of the Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th inst., with reference to the draft of a proposed Order in Council for applying Part III. of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, to the county of London. In reply, I am to state for the information of the London County Council that the form which the final Order in Council, for giving effect to the compulsory clauses of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, will take, will no doubt be settled with due regard to any suggestions which may be received from the county council. But the intention at present is that the Order shall be made to take effect progressively according to a division of the county into convenient areas not less than four in number.

"The first area, comprising one-fourth or less of the county, would be selected with a view to the utilisation of the existing offices in Lincoln's-inn-fields as the Land Registry of the district.

"This method of carrying the Order into effect will have the advantage of not throwing immediately a very heavy burden on the registry, and will also afford such an opportunity as the county council appear to desire of estimating the value of the work as it proceeds, and of watching generally the progress of the Act.

"I am to add that any representations which their experience of the Act might lead the county council to make, would undoubtedly receive careful consideration.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"(Signed) C. L. PEEL.

"The Clerk of the London County Council, Spring-gardens, S.W."

The committee thought that, in the event of the council not passing a resolution of veto, the Privy Council should be informed that the London County Council relied on the statement in the letter that the Order would be so framed that it should be made to take effect progressively, and should not in the first instance be made to apply to more than one-fourth of the county. They had accordingly asked their chairman to move, should a resolution of veto not be passed: "That the Privy Council be informed that the London County Council relies on the Order applying the Land Transfer Act, 1897, to London being so framed that it shall be made to take effect progressively, and shall not in the first instance be made to apply to more than one-fourth of the county."

Mr. E. BOULNOIS, M.P., asked the chairman of the committee how many communications had been received, whether in reply to the council's letters or voluntarily, and how many were in favour of applying the Act and how many against?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN said that eighty-eight replies had been received; of these fourteen were in favour of the application of the Act, sixty-seven were against, and seven made no sign. Since the consideration of the matter on the 7th inst. a letter had been received from a local board in favour of the application of the Act, one from the City Corporation against, one from a building society against, and seventeen from brewery companies, all against.

Mr. BOULNOIS asked that the letter from the corporation might be read. He thought it very important.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN read the letter, which was dated the 11th of February, and stated as follows: "The Court of Common Council at its meeting yesterday unanimously adopted the report of its Law and City Courts Committee, to whom the consideration of the matter had been referred, expressing their opinion that it is not expedient that registration of title should be made compulsory either in the county of London or in the city under the Land Transfer Act of 1897."

Mr. T. A. ORGAN asked that the replies from the Camberwell, St. Pancras, and Battersea vestries might be read.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN read the replies in question, which were to the following effect: Camberwell Vestry—"In the opinion of the vestry the registration of the transfer of land and landed property by a central authority is for the benefit of the public generally, especially where accompanied by a small and inclusive scale of charges for titles and mortgages, as in the Torrens Act, Australia." St. Pancras Vestry—"In their opinion the administration of the county of London is the best place to try the experiment of the operation of the Act as regards the compulsory registration of land." Battersea Vestry—"The vestry are in favour of the application of the Act to the county of London."

The Rev. FLEMING WILLIAMS asked how many solicitors had advised that the Act should be applied in the county of London.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN said he could not answer the question. He had no analysis as to which of the vestry clerks were solicitors.

Mr. ORGAN asked whether the replies received from building societies indicated the views of the members of the societies or of the legal officials.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN said that the replies did not specify.

Mr. H. H. MARKS, M.P., asked if the replies were submitted to the solicitors of the vestries and other bodies before being forwarded to the council.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN said it was impossible for him to answer that question.

Mr. C. JEROME moved as an amendment, in accordance with notice: "(*a*) That in the opinion of the London County Council compulsory registration of title under the provisions of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, would not be desirable in their county. (*b*) That the clerk of the council be instructed to forthwith communicate the foregoing resolution to the Privy Council." He said that in his opinion the operation of the Act would have the immediate effect of very considerably increasing the profits of solicitors. Fortunately this question was not a party question, but it was one of the most important that had ever come under the consideration of the council, and it required that members should have a sufficient understanding of the effect of the Act, and that they should use their unbiassed judgment whether they would allow London to be experimented upon. There was nothing at present to prevent any owner of property from going to the Land Registry Office and registering his title, and why people who did not desire to be placed upon the register should be compelled to do so he was quite at a loss to understand. But his idea when he gave notice of the motion had been considerably affected by the fact that they could not shut their eyes, as men of business and as representatives of the people of London, to the fact that a great number of reasons had been given against the Act, and hardly any reasons on its behalf. And a vast number of most important companies, undertakings, and industries had expressed their opinion that it would be most detrimental to their interests to allow the Act to operate in London. They had also pointed out that there was no reason why the experiment should not be tried in some other county with smaller interests than was the case in London. He thought there was reason to complain of the way in which the matter was brought before them. They had seen none of the rules which would be required to make the Act work. He understood that these would number between 300 and 400, and it was not fair to those who represented the vast interests which opposed the Act that they should be asked to give judgment in this manner. With regard to the operation of the Act he desired to give an illustration. He would assume the case of a man, having forty or fifty houses, who wanted to raise as much as he could upon them. He would go to a banker, taking his deeds. The banker would say, "Before I can lend you this money you must put your title on the register, because I may have to do so, and then I should be put to the expense of doing it." That was one of the difficulties and delays which would arise through the Act in a personal transaction where money was sought to be raised. He was sure there would be very great difficulty in the case of joint tenancy, where a man had a plot of freehold land and he erected four or five buildings thereon, and, dying, devised his property to his children. Referring to the opinion of the Land Registry he said that the learned gentleman who was the assistant-registrar had favoured the council with the results of his visits to Germany, and he very much wished that title in England should be as it was there. He (Mr. Jerome) believed that would be anything but beneficial, and that as things made in Germany were complained of as cheap and nasty, that would be the case with the land title. He thought it was unfair to London with its vast interests to impose the Act upon it, when the Privy Council could, with the greatest ease, apply it to some smaller county.

Mr. H. T. BANNING seconded the amendment. He did so for many reasons, but principally in the interests of the smaller landowners in

London. The bigger landowners, he had no doubt, could take care of themselves, and he could imagine cases where registration might be beneficial to them; but as regarded the smaller landowners of London, who were a very numerous class, the Act would be productive of expense, confusion, and delay. To his mind the Act was very obscure, and he had given a great deal of attention to it. It contained twenty-six clauses only, but it was one of those Acts which would work only by reference to others. It was most undesirable in a case which affected the property of everybody in London, that the Act should be one which dealt by incorporation, and not entirely a new Act in the nature of a code of its own that anyone could take up and read and understand. It incorporated by reference an Act of 126 sections, and the result was an amount of obscurity which was most undesirable, and this obscurity would lead to trouble and delay in all matters coming under the Act. He complained of the absence of all notice as to what the orders and rules would be. Under the original Act of 1875 there were 250 rules which had to be understood. With regard to the expense, he had received, as he had no doubt the other members of the Council had, a most interesting circular from the Temperance Permanent Benefit Building Society. That society had about 700 transactions in the year, which varied from a small amount to about £1,000. The loss by the new Act would be about £2 2s. on the smaller transactions and £5 5s. on the larger, and there would be a loss of £4,200 a year if the Act came into operation. There was one good thing in the Act, and that was the power to remove titles. He believed that power would be largely exercised. In the case of people who had been so unwise as to register under the Act of 1875, he had known instances where they had gone to considerable expense and trouble to remove the titles. They had had to go to the High Court to do so. Of course it was the compulsion that was objected to in London. It had been said that London ought to take the lead at once. What was to prevent London from taking the lead if people wished to do so? Any landowner could register his title if he wished to do so. Though a great many great lawyers, distinguished judges, and legislators had advocated registration he believed there was not one of them who had even put their own land on the register.

Mr. CHARLES FORD: What is your authority?

Mr. BANNING: I believe that is so.

Mr. FORD: Oh, nonsense!

Mr. BANNING said he did not say that the Land Registry might not be a great success. He need not put it so high as to say it would be a failure, but he said that if the chances were one in twenty or one in a hundred of being a failure the experiment ought not to be tried in London, but somewhere where the facts were less complicated. There was no place where it was so difficult to carry it out as London. In London even half inches were of great value, therefore it was particularly dangerous to apply the Act to such property. He thought the effect of the Act would be to add one more search, and put one more difficulty in the way of all transactions in land. It would be a perfect terror to trustees because, in all cases trustees would have to see that the necessary caveat and inhibition were inserted in the register according to the Act of Parliament. The principal effect of making the Act compulsory in London would be to greatly increase expense and litigation, and it would not be far from putting the whole of London in the Court of Chancery.

Sir ARTHUR ARNOLD said that, having given the subject attention for many years, he was somewhat acquainted with its history. He was convinced that this was the commencement of a great and valuable reform, and for that reason he had been in hope that no motion of this sort would have been proposed in the council. With the greatest possible respect for the mover and seconder, he was rather glad that if a motion of this sort was to be made it should come from them because he was certainly able to say they did not occupy a commanding position in the official relation to their party in the council. If he were a lawyer he would feel a very strong reluctance to taking up the position the mover had assumed, because all the great lawyers of his (Sir Arthur Arnold's) lifetime without a single exception had recommended this reform. He remembered that Lord Cairns was strongly in favour of it. Lord Selborne had advocated compulsory registration. He had listened to Lord Hatherley advocating the same view, he had heard Lord Herschell, and again he had heard Lord Halsbury advocating the same reform. If he were a lawyer and had regard to that great body of impartial testimony he should think more than three times before standing up in the council and opposing it. Both the mover and seconder used the argument that at the present moment anyone could register his title, and the seconder had said that not one of the Lord Chancellors had used the registry. These Lord Chancellors had told the House of Lords that they were of opinion it should be compulsory, and were the members of the County Council of London the people to protest against compulsion? This was not the place to go into technicalities, but he held that they should rather weigh what had been done and said in Parliament and should give it their support. If he were a Conservative he would hesitate before opposing a measure which was proposed not only by the present Government but which had been proposed by Lord Halsbury, not merely as the Chancellor of the Unionist Government, but as the Chancellor of a Conservative Government, and no one could say the present Government was hostile in any way to property. What was the value of the memorials that came up to the council? Nine-tenths of them were prepared mainly by the officials of those bodies and not by the members themselves. They were prepared by the officials who had been trained and were skilled in the vicious system of conveyancing. He was not hostile to the City of London, but he was not at all surprised to find the City in the rear in this matter. They were in their proper place on this occasion. One gentleman had spoken of the difficulty of borrowing money. He had known not one or two but fifty cases of bogus deeds upon which money had been lent and lost which could not occur under a system of registration. One of the greatest changes now proposed was to substitute conveyance by register of title for conveyance by deed. He thought it most proper that the council should have been selected as the metropolitan county. But there was another reason. In the greater part of the county there was practically compulsion to register every transaction in land, and at the present moment that office had been moved altogether to the office of Land Registry so as to facilitate a procedure of this sort. Some of the members had received hundreds of circulars on the subject. He humbly suggested they should not regard them, because to a great degree in the vote they were called upon to give they were divested of responsibility—to this extent, that Government after Government, Chancellor after Chancellor, for the last forty years, certainly thirty-five years, had repeatedly recommended the adoption of this reform. Were they to resist such a continuous and concurrent stream of evidence by both parties on the subject? It was impossible for any man, with due regard for the Government, and for the eminent men in the law especially who had been the advocates of the measure, to take any other course than to vote against the proposal.

Mr. W. J. BULL thought it would be a very good thing for lawyers for many years to come if the Act were put into operation. He protested against the officialism which prevailed. The operation of the Act sounded, of course, very easy. All they had to do was to put their land on the register; then there would be a sort of gigantic cheque-book. When one wanted to transfer one's land the official behind the counter would say, "Where is it?" The answer would be, "Here is a plan," and then there would be a sort of cheque-book instead of deeds. He thought that was the general idea of the lay mind as to how the registry was going to act, and that all the expensive deeds would be done away with. But he should like to point out that the same sort of thing was held out to the British public when that excellent Bankruptcy Act of Mr. Chamberlain's was passed. All the work went into the hands of the officials. Was that practical? All who knew anything about the work knew that, although the Act was in theory very admirable, it did not reach the debtors as it ought. There was a very great deal of lack of industry and energy because of the officialism. He knew of a case not very long ago in which a large quantity of timber in a case of bankruptcy would have been seized for the creditors if the matter had been in private hands, but in the bankruptcy office there was so much red tape that it was taken away and disappeared long before the officials moved in the matter. With regard to the petitions against the Act, unworthy sneers had been cast at the lawyers. Why did the county council ask for the opinions of these various bodies? Surely those opinions were entitled to some consideration. So many large bodies could not be dominated by their solicitors, and it was unjustifiable to draw that conclusion. With regard to legislation, it was proposed that from a certain date nothing could be done in dealing with land without compulsory registration. But before that everyone must make his title clear. At present in these matters there was always a certain amount of give and take between the solicitors employed, but in what was now proposed there would be two or three classes of title—first class, second class, and parliamentary, and he wanted to know what person would be satisfied with anything but a first-class title. There were a great many titles at the present moment which would bear investigation by solicitors which, under the iron-bound rules of the registry in Lincoln's-inn, would not be passed. And when once these titles were questioned irreparable harm would be done to the property. Sir Arthur Arnold had referred to several successive Chancellors who had advocated compulsory registration. Very few of these Chancellors had been conveyancers. They had all very great experience in other branches of the law, but none of them were conveyancing lawyers. Mention had been made of German registration of title. In his private capacity he had been trying to get a title on the register in Germany for the last eighteen months and had not succeeded. He had been over there and had some small knowledge of the language, so that had not stood in his way. He could not persuade the Germans what a trust was. They would have the Government official standing warming himself before the fire with the *Times* in his hand. Then there would be the ordinary layman coming to a pigeon-hole and saying he wanted to register or transfer his title. "Very well, you must get form 499*b* and fill it up." The applicant would get the form and bring it back, and if right it would be passed. If it was wrong he would be sent back again, and finally it was to be presumed in due course the title would be registered. Then as to mortgages; these entered greatly into our social life, and it had been the habit after a title had been once examined that the solicitor did first look it through, and the money would be advanced without trouble, and there was secrecy. There was only a memorandum to be signed. After the first occasion the bank manager did not trouble, and everything was done without any difficulty. How would it work under the Act? Sir Arthur Arnold said that in place of deeds there would be a gigantic cheque. What would be the state of affairs? Was the bank manager going up to the registry and put his name in the counterfoil beside the name of the owner, and state that he has an interest in the land of £300 or £400? If he did that then he would possibly damage his customer. His customer possibly did not want that to be known. On the other hand, supposing the bank manager said, "I do not wish to hurt your credit, I will take the certificate for what it is worth," then the title became untrue. It was not an absolute title because, as a matter of fact, the document, or rather the register, did not represent the exact facts of the case. He asked the council to consider that there was something in individual effort. It was the individual effort, the individual care exercised by the private person, which enabled dealing with property in land to be carried on as was at present the case. He believed the time would come after the Act had been in force three months when the council would consider whether it should not be withdrawn. He understood it had been suggested that the county

of London should be divided up into districts, but considering the great value of the property to be dealt with he did not think the Act should be first tried here. The council knew he was not speaking merely in a jealous or narrow spirit on behalf of his profession, but he did think it was well to consider the other side of the question before they made this drastic, this tremendous change in the law of London. Let it be tried in Rutland or somewhere where property was not of such great value.

The Right Hon. G. J. SHAW-LEFEVRE said he was a member of the committee of the House of Commons nineteen years ago—in 1871—which investigated this matter. And the then chairman, Lord Cairns, came before the committee and gave the most admirable and lucid evidence in favour of compulsory registration and against the present system, and completely converted him to his views as to the merits of the system. When the committee concluded its labours he drew up a report for the committee which he shewed to Lord Cairns, recommending precisely the course now adopted, introducing compulsion by degrees, beginning in London. He gave his reason for introducing the system in London. A few years later he determined to make an experiment himself in registering property in the Land Registry with an absolute title. He had a small property in the suburbs consisting of about ten houses let on long leases. Some of the occupiers desired to purchase the houses from him. He thought it a good opportunity for trying the Land Registry, and took his title-deeds to the registry unbeknown to his family solicitors, who, no doubt, would have advised against it, and he did the transaction without the slightest assistance from any lawyer and without any delay whatever. He paid a very small sum for the registration, and had dealt with and sold the houses on several different occasions, and had not found it necessary, nor had the purchaser, to employ lawyers. He and the purchaser went to the Land Registry together and did the transfer, and all they had to pay, where the transaction was £300, was 18s., whereas the recognised legal charge by his solicitor would have been £5 for each party. Therefore there was the difference between £10 and 18s. His experience had proved most conclusively that registration of title could be effected through the Land Registry without the intervention of any lawyer. He was not surprised, therefore, that lawyers should object to the registry. He did not pretend that it would not interfere with their profits, but after all they, like other great interests where great economical changes had taken place, must suffer. It was like the change from hand-loom weaving to the power loom, and so forth, and the lawyers had no more right to impede and prevent a great change of this kind than had the weavers in the case he had referred to. It might interest the council to see the title (holding up several deeds) under which he held the property before registering. He was glad to say they had all become useless. This was the title under which he held from the registry (holding up one document), a single page. It was a mere certificate of title, and if it were lost he could get another certificate from the registry. The opposition to the measure came from two sources, either from the solicitors or from bodies like the building societies, and so forth, who thought that, certainly in the immediate future, they would be compelled to employ lawyers as well as use the registry. He believed that was a pure delusion, and he cited his own experience to prove the contrary. It would be found perfectly possible to register absolute title on the register without the intervention of the lawyer. It was said "Why deal with London?" He thought there were very sound and good reasons. In the first place there was already a system of registration of deeds. Every lawyer who had looked into the matter had come to the conclusion that the registration of deeds was expensive and perfectly unnecessary, but the staff and the registry and the whole machinery would be very useful. It was thought the proper thing to try the system on a large scale, and it could be far better introduced in London than anywhere else. He had come most strongly to the conviction that the introduction of compulsory registration would be an enormous boon to the owners of property and those who desired to become owners of property, and especially in London, and he believed, therefore, that this great boon should be tried first in London.

Lord FARRER said it had been his good fortune to be associated with the present Lord Thring in preparing the law which enacted amongst other things provision for the registration of ships and transfer by registration. That was in 1853. Lord Thring bestowed immense pains upon the matter and prepared admirable clauses, and after the Act was passed Lord Thring and he and the then solicitor of the customs prepared a number of forms. It was possible to transfer a ship from London to Calcutta, and the owner of a 69th part of a ship could transfer it. He could also mortgage with the same facility. That system had been in operation since 1854, and had been found perfectly easy and perfectly satisfactory to the shipping interest. The Act was renewed three or four years ago and it was not found necessary to alter any of the clauses and hardly any of the forms. Not many years after the Act was passed a deputation of shipowners from a great port came up to the president of the Board of Trade and begged him to alter the system and to re-introduce all the complications of title they had before. The deputation was headed by a solicitor, and after Mr. Henley, the then president, had heard them, he said, "I can perfectly understand that the alterations you require would be for the benefit of certain interests. I do not think they would be for the benefit of the shipowning interest." He (Lord Farrer) saw no reason why the system applied to ships should not be equally applied to land.

Sir JOHN HUTTON hoped that before the end of the discussion there would be some authoritative expression of opinion on the part of the Moderate party, because he thought that if the obligation was thrown upon the council to express an opinion, the responsibility of that opinion should be shared by both sections of the council. He could not see his way to vote for the application of the Act to London. He was not a solicitor, but if he were he was sure he should not be more influenced by mercenary considerations than he ventured to think the solicitor-members of the council had been influenced. He was sorry such an aspersion should be cast upon an honourable profession, a profession to which every member of society was greatly indebted. As a layman he looked upon the proposed registration of title under the three heads, absolute, qualified, and possessory, as a signal disadvantage to those who only had a possessory title. He was aware that effluxion of time would help, but what did that mean? Twenty years hence probably the slur would, as far as it could be by effluxion of time, be removed. And this document, the observations of the Land Registry, what had they to say upon that, to him, very important conditions of the Act? In this it was argued that a qualified title was no more a slur on the title than the ordinary conditions of sale used by vendors were. Who in the council would be prepared, if they were familiar with dealings with property, to say that an absolute expression upon the certificate labelling the property first, second, or third-class was no more a slur on the title than the ordinary conditions of sale? The conditions of sale were made very wide and general, so as to include any imperfection. It was never contested that there was any slur, but another set of considerations would come in when a man's property was labelled as only secondary in title. The observations said there was nothing detrimental about it, and that no one would know of it except the owner. He thought this a not very worthy suggestion. This was the convincing document of the registry. It referred to the subject of costs, and the suggestion was to a person casually reading it that the present cost of conveyancing under the scale being £3, the cost for a similar transaction in the registry would be 1s. 6d.; but the cost would be at present the £3 and the 1s. 6d. in addition. It was not fair to follow a comparison of this kind, because it suggested that the party could transact the matter for himself. They had not all the facility that Mr. Shaw-Lefevre had of conducting their own property transactions. He had a little property himself, and he should be very sorry indeed if he dabbled in any legal matters in connection with it of that kind, which required a lifetime of experience and a special training. He had never ventured beyond the proper province of a client in such matters, and had always been very well content with the result. But Mr. Shaw-Lefevre told them he went to the Land Registry and obtained for himself the certificate. He wondered if Mr. Shaw-Lefevre introduced himself by saying, "I am a member of Parliament, and I want to see the effect of the present system of land registry." He could imagine that, in the seclusion of that office, a man would be very glad to get the opportunity of distinguishing himself and to render every possible facility to a gentleman of the eminence and distinction of Mr. Shaw-Lefevre. But that could not occur to everyone, and if people generally were bold enough to try to conduct a transfer of property they might come to signal grief. What would be the condition of things if the whole of London, with its 600,000 houses and enormous property, came to the registry. Instead of the registrar longing for a job, so to speak, he would immediately and very rightly say, "I am not going to give you instructions. You must have your papers properly prepared. There are the instructions, fill them in and see that they are correct." That would be the condition of things if the office became crowded. But they were told that ample provision would be made for the speedy and expeditious transfer of property, two or three days, or at most a week, being necessary. He thought this was illusory. The committee had asked for the opinion of various bodies. For what purpose was that but for the guidance of the council? And when they got sixty-seven replies against the application of the Act and fourteen for them, though the intention was that they should have blessed the Act, they had altogether cursed it. With regard to the instigation of the replies by the solicitors he knew intimately some of the bodies which had sent in replies, and he was quite certain that the solicitors representing them had had no influence whatever in deciding the board as to whether the reply should be affirmatory or otherwise. The Auctioneers' Institute, a body composed of men whose great desire must be to facilitate the transfer of land, was opposed to it. A letter had been read from the Vestry of Battersea, but although the letter concluded with a suggestion that the Act should not be applied to London, it did not give any reason why it should not be so applied. Then again, in the case of St. Pancras no reason was given, so that no argument was adduced as to why the Act should be applied to London. London was not suitable for the application of the Act. Those who desired to avail themselves of the Land Registry could do so, and the office had been spoken of to-day as expeditious and cheap. Anyone enamoured of the system could go there and satisfy himself as to its cheapness and expedition. Those who preferred the registry were few in number; after the illustration given to-day they might increase. Let them if they liked and could do the work of the family solicitor go there if they pleased. But the application of compulsory registration to all dealings with property would vastly increase the cost and in the end be greatly detrimental.

Lieutenant-Colonel A. ROTTON observed that those who had spoken so highly in favour of the application of the Act must have convinced a great number of the great advantages to be gained by it. But none of these gentlemen mentioned, as Sir John Hutton had mentioned, that every one who preferred registration at the present time could avail himself of all these great advantages. He complained that compulsion should be brought to bear upon the people who did not want to avail themselves of these great advantages. That they did not avail themselves of it proved that they did not want it. He was not a lawyer, but they were bound to take the experience of those who had a great deal to do with the transfer of land, and who by their experience knew whether the registry was a good thing or not. Let them take the case of the building societies, of which a large number were in London. When the Bill was first proposed

to be made compulsory in London a large majority of these societies thought it would be a good thing, and were in favour of it. When they came carefully to consider all the points brought before them, they came to the conclusion that it would be very disadvantageous not only to themselves as building societies, but to the poor people who buy small properties through their means. So strongly were they of opinion that this was the case that he believed he was correct in saying that they were, practically speaking, unanimously agreed that it was not advisable to apply the Act to London. Surely an argument of that sort should not be lost sight of by the council. It was all very well to be carried away by the eloquence of Sir Arthur Arnold or of Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, but they had a very serious duty to perform to decide on the common sense view whether it was advisable to make it compulsory upon people to do what they did not wish, or whether it was better to leave things as they were at present. He urged that the experiment should be tried in a smaller place where, if the advantages were so very great, unquestionably they would all be delighted, and everybody would wish to avail themselves of the great opportunity afforded by the Act. The only object of the building societies was to get land transfer made as cheap and as easy as possible. He had no shares in building societies. Their opinion, in his view, was so strong and so convincing that he hoped the council would pause before supporting the application of the Act to London.

Mr. H. L. W. Lawson said the responsibility of the council was both less and greater than had been represented. The responsibility lay with the Privy Council—that was to say, her Majesty's Government. It lay with the Lord Chancellor, and there was no statesman at the present time more careful in the interests of property and the good of his own profession. The council was asked whether they were prepared to vote the reform. He did not think members were indulging in an unworthy sneer when they said that great part of the opposition to-day was interested. It was no slur on the directors or shareholders of a railway company if they opposed the introduction of a railway into their district. They were fighting for their own interests. And if lawyers were chary of losing their fees no one could complain. He was not speaking without book. He should like to see how the lawyers arrived at the astounding statement that the cost of registration under the new system would be far larger than at present. The methods were very simple. Mr. Rubinstein, a very able lawyer, had spoken on the subject, and had addressed many letters to the papers. He said the Attorney-General must know he was talking nonsense when he said the cost of transfer would be reduced by one-fifth under the Land Transfer Act, and he worked out the total. But he had added the cost under the Act to the scale charges of the solicitor, and said the total cost in the future will be in the two charges combined. Well, they had had one example this afternoon. Mr. Shaw-Lefevre had proved the simplicity with which the work can be carried out without the intervention of the lawyer, and it could be done at the present moment by the great building societies and other associations. The building societies protested against the Act, and he thought they proceeded to tell the council that they deal with an enormous number of cases in which a transfer was concluded within a single day on a simple form. What they did the whole community could have the benefit of when the new system had had time to work. All he wanted was, that just as the building societies did without the intervention of a solicitor, so it would be possible in the future in the smaller transactions to do without the intervention of the solicitor and the charges which Mr. Rubinstein reckoned as forming part of this new tax to be put upon the public when they had to concern themselves with the transfer of land. Then it was said that all that was offered was a possessory title, and that they would not get an absolute title. He would like to ask any member of the county council with small dealings in land whether he had more than a possessory title now. Was it not the custom to insert a clause waiving the investigation of title in all small transactions? As a rule, investigation of title was done without in all small transactions in the great societies, so that all that the purchaser got was a possessory title. He contended that the Act would prevent a great deal of fraud in connection with mortgages. When the mortgage was registered on the cheque, as it had been called which embodied the title, it would be a protection to individuals and to the great associations when they had to deal with the business they were doing to-day. He believed that in time very great improvement would be effected, and he quoted an instance which had been alluded to that afternoon. He quite admitted that the Australian system could not be taken as entirely analogous, because it was there applied to a new country with few complications. But he referred to the system in Prussia. The system there enabled people to deal in land for as many shillings as we had to pay pounds for the charges of transfer. There was in that country an old and complicated system of feudal title, more complicated possibly than our own. It was swept clean out of the way and a simple system substituted which had been satisfactory. Mr. Bull had said he could not get a deed registered, but it was not because of any difficulty in the system, but because he could not make the Prussian officials understand the peculiarity of trustees in London. In this matter we had a great deal to learn from Germany. Lord Farrer had spoken on the question of ships. In that case the difficulties of distance almost made up for the difficulties of complication in the case of land, and what had been done with such eminent success with respect to ships could, he was perfectly persuaded, be done in time with land. It would take time. All he asked the council was, to pause before it took a step which would tend to delay cheapening and making easy the transfer of land in its county.

Dr. T. B. Napier protested against the way in which Sir Arthur Arnold had put the case. He had told them that Bills dealing with registration of title had been introduced by several Governments, and he had inferred, therefore, that all these Governments were strongly in favour of registration of title. Everybody knew that Bills of this kind were very often introduced that they might test the general sense of the community, and a very large number of these Bills had avowedly been introduced by successive Chancellors for the purpose of elucidating local opinion. Parliament had come to the conclusion that the best manner of dealing with the subject was, that the discussion should get into the body of the people, and that each county should deal with it upon its merits, and after receiving the benefit of advice from various bodies of persons in its jurisdiction. Therefore, to-day they were not going to act upon the opinions of great Chancellors or great lawyers, but they were determining the matter as advised by various bodies. He felt, speaking as a lawyer, a certain diffidence after the lecture which had been read by Sir Arthur Arnold to the first two speakers. He did not see why lawyers who had studied the question a little, and who had some feelings about it, should not be heard. He was in favour of registration of title in the abstract, but he did not think it nearly such an important thing as it was twenty or thirty years ago in the time of Lord Cairns. Enormous reforms had been effected in conveyancing. It was perfectly easy to transfer and convey land in a way which would have been astonishing forty years ago. To come in 1898 and quote what was said in 1862 was to quote language which had nothing whatever to do with the existing condition of things. He could not support the proposition because he believed the effect of these proposals would be, for probably more than twenty years, that the cost of land transfer would be considerably increased. It was quite clear that in the present time in the majority of instances they would have to pay the solicitor's fees, and they would have to pay the Land Transfer Office fees. But he thought they would always have to do so. Let any lawyer take the trouble to read through this Act of 1897. He had never read a more complicated Act of Parliament. He had never read one which was more likely to give rise to greater litigation. He should from a personal point of view if the council were to confirm the Act. He believed that for the next twenty years to come there would be an enormous amount of work for the lawyers in consequence. In his opinion it would never be possible under the Act for the parties to do as Mr. Shaw-Lefevre had done—viz, to go into the registry, register the title, and convey the property. Mr. Shaw-Lefevre was a man of extraordinary intellect. He was a barrister and a man of great experience, and it was beside the question to talk of what Mr. Shaw-Lefevre would do in the registry, and what the ordinary man in the street would do. He asserted without fear of contradiction that supposing, after twenty years, the possessory title could be turned under the Bill into what was called an absolute title, that even so it would be unsafe for any man who was careful with regard to his property to go into the registry and transfer his property without the aid of a lawyer. It was only necessary to study what by the Act you could put upon the register to see that it would be essential for a man, twenty or thirty years hence, to employ a lawyer. He believed it would be perfectly possible to introduce a system of registration of title, but before that it would be necessary to simplify the way in which English land could be held. He said with great regret that he thought that for the council not to veto the application of the Act would be an injury to those who had to deal with property in land.

Mr. G. H. Radford said that, under the present system, if a man had a piece of land he wished to sell he employed a solicitor, who abstracted his deeds and perused the title for forty years or so. The purchaser employed a solicitor, who also perused the title for forty years, and the transaction was carried through. If the purchaser wanted to mortgage the land as soon as he had acquired it, he had to go through the same process again, and the mortgagee had to employ a solicitor also, and eventually a mortgage was completed. The costs of all these four solicitors had to be paid. He did not say they were overpaid, because the work they did was of a delicate character and involved responsibility; but he said that their whole industry was absolutely futile and unnecessary, and that it was a great waste of money. The object of the Act was to simplify the transfer of land, and the principle was that when once a title was investigated the subject was closed. The fact that it had been proved to be a good title would be put on record, and it would be unnecessary to go through the investigation again. The present system was a very heavy tax upon the property owners, a very great grievance, and almost intolerable if people were not so docile in the hands of their solicitors. He could confirm from his own experience the remarks made by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre. He had seen transactions of various kinds—mortgages, purchases, and so on—carried out under the existing Act. The thing could be done easily, cheaply, and rapidly. Whether we should ever arrive at a time when the community had developed such intelligence as was possessed by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre and be all able to dispense with solicitors he doubted. But even if it was necessary to employ a solicitor, they would be able to employ him for much less money under the new system. There was a very formidable array of bodies said to be opposed to the measure. There was Lord Portman. He did not know why he was included. Lord Portman was the owner of large estates, and his business consisted in preparing leases which were paid for by the lessee. It was much more important for some poor builder on the verge of bankruptcy to have cheap transfer than for Lord Portman. Neither did he know why Mr. Rubinstein was included as giving weight to the opposition. It would have been possible to get twenty-five solicitors to oppose the Act. But he asked them to look at the other list. He knew that in one case the solicitor of one of these bodies was called by the chairman of the body, and the chairman said, "This is a matter more for you than for me. What do you think of it?" Well, he was against it, and the objection appeared on the paper. And that was the history of nearly all these transactions. There was one genuine, honest objector, and that was the Incorporated Law Society. He had the greatest respect for the Incorporated Law Society; he had been a member of it for twenty-five years. It consisted of men of high integrity, he believed — men who would not sacrifice the public

interest for their personal advantage, men of particular skill in this matter of conveyancing, but if they had a fault it was that they were a trifle conservative. There were old men still living who would tell you that there had been no justice in England since the Common Law Procedure Act was reformed; and most solicitors admitted to practise before the Judicature Act of 1873 would say that it had caused ruin and disaster. It was well known on every hand that these law reforms had been of great advantage to the people of the country. He did not say the legal opposition had any interested or improper motive; it was simply the opposition of gentlemen who had acquired with great skill the system now in vogue, and who found it impossible to believe that any other system could be better. In a matter of this sort they should not give undue weight to the opposition of the Incorporated Law Society. If they did, they would have to wait a long time, probably until Doomsday, if they expected to get any legal reform with the consent of the Incorporated Law Society. They might, perhaps, as well hope to persuade the clergy to abolish religion as the members of the Incorporated Law Society to submit to any measure of legal reform. This had been the experience of all law reformers. He should be very sorry to place Lord Halsbury on the same pedestal with Lord Brougham or Sir Samuel Romilly, but it was fair to say that he resembled them in this, that he had practically the whole legal profession against him, and he thought Lord Halsbury was entitled to the sympathy of gentlemen on his own side of the House, and to the support of every member of the council. A great deal had been made of the opposition of the building societies, and if there was any opinion he should desire to defer to, it would be that of the building societies. The Temperance Permanent Building Society had sent a document round which was grossly misleading. They sought to say that the transactions under the proposed system would be much more costly than present transactions. It was, perhaps, not known to members that building societies employed what they called a tame solicitor, and, under an arrangement with him, he made a reduction in the charges on taking a quantity. The building societies compared the charges of their solicitors with the scale charges, and added to these sums the cost of registration. That was grossly unfair, because when the Act was in operation the building societies would make their arrangements with their tame solicitors, and would get at least as good terms as now, and probably better, and in a little time the building societies would dispense with solicitors altogether and manage their own affairs, and there would be a great saving. In his opinion the system proposed was simple, easy, and cheap. The experience of the Act of 1872 had proved that it was practicable and cheap and good. The present system was well-nigh intolerable.

Mr. R. Parker said he was a member of the sub-committee which considered the matter, and could bear out what Mr. Radford had said with regard to the answers of solicitors. Even the solicitor of the council had reported unfavourably upon the Act. The reason the committee had asked these societies for their opinions was because they wanted as much information as possible, but these replies had been very well answered by the Middlesex Land Registry. He believed registration would be a good thing for the people of London generally.

Mr. E. Bond, M.P., said he had been for some time lecturer on conveyancing at the Incorporated Law Society, and he therefore knew something about conveyancing. He had also been for a number of years chairman of one of those land societies which bought land wholesale and sold it retail, and he was perfectly familiar with the process of transactions of the kind. The title was accepted by the parties, and the expense and trouble of conveyancing were reduced to a minimum. He had come to the conclusion that it was extremely undesirable that the council should oppose the application of the Act. He thought it was Colonel Rotton's opinion that if the Act came into operation everybody within the district would be compelled to put his land upon the register. That was a pure misapprehension. The compulsion came in when a transfer took place. If a man sold his land, then the man who bought would be at the risk of certain inconveniences if he did not put his land on the register. It was suggested that a solicitor would still have to be employed, and so the expense would be increased. He did not conceive if the Act came into operation that the solicitors' charges could be maintained at their present rate, and if the solicitor had to be employed there must be a great reduction of his fees and of the expense of registration. Parliament had decided that the Act should be tried, and the question was whether London was the right place. It appeared to him that it was for that reason that there already existed this land registry which was accustomed to deal with registration of title under the Act of 1872. They knew the whole machinery, and, moreover, they knew approximately about how many purchase-deeds would come into the office in a given period, and they said that if the process was introduced gradually, and a fourth only of the county of London dealt with at one time, they would be able to cope with the deeds likely to be brought in. An objection had been made that owing to the large number of properties and the extensive subdivisions there would be so much business that it could not be dealt with. He found the answer of the Land Registry upon that point to be abundantly satisfactory. He did not think the council ought to stand in the way of the experiment being tried.

Mr. W. H. Dickinson said the council were bound to discuss the matter carefully, as the result would be most important to the population of London. There were present members of Her Majesty's Government, and yet the discussion had been carried on chiefly by members of the Progressive party, with only one Moderate speaking in favour of carrying the Act into execution. The council ought to have been assisted by the noble lord (Onslow) who was a member of the Government. He appealed to him to assist in the debate. They had not heard a word from any member representing the party who had protested against the application of the Act At this meeting four Moderates had spoken for the Act and two against it. It was, therefore, not a party question, and had not been discussed in that sense. The matter ought to be discussed by the leading members on the other side. The council ought not to go against the Act unless there were very conclusive reasons, and he must say that those who had spoken in favour of the veto had not given sufficiently conclusive evidence against it.

Here there were loud cries of "Onslow," but Lord Onslow did not respond.

Mr. H. P. Harris said he intended to vote against the veto, because it seemed to him that Parliament had decided that it was desirable that registration of title should be tried. Having been trained in the conveyancing system his instinct had been against the Act, but having looked at the matter it seemed to him that there was no reason against applying it in the first case to London. If it had been applied to the whole of London he should have felt inclined to vote against the Act, but as it was only to a part of London he should not oppose it.

Lord Onslow moved, amidst laughter, that the question be now put.

Mr. Jerome claimed his right to reply. He pointed out that by allowing the Act to operate in London, if it should turn out to be a failure the poor people would be in a very disastrous position with regard to their property with a title that was bad. He believed it would be an utter failure, and that they were perfectly justified in coming to that view when the Land Registry had been open for over twenty years and no one used it.

The motion was put and negatived.

A division was called for, when the numbers were: for Mr. Jerome's motion, 35; against, 72.

The Vice-Chairman then moved: "That the Privy Council be informed that the London County Council relies on the Order applying the Land Transfer Act, 1897, to London being so framed that it shall be made to take effect progressively, and shall not in the first instance be made to apply to more than one-fourth of the county."

Sir Arthur Arnold observed that it would be better if they included practically the whole of the letter, and proposed to leave out all the words after the word "effect," and to add "according to the letter from the clerk of the Privy Council of the 18th of January, 1898." That would not alter the sense of the motion.

The motion as altered was agreed to.

The resolution as adopted in its altered form would, therefore, read as follows: "That the Privy Council be informed that the London County Council relies on the order applying the Land Transfer Act, 1897, to London being so framed that it shall be made to take effect according to the letter from the clerk of the Privy Council of the 18th of January, 1898." This letter is quoted above.

LAW SOCIETIES.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The following is the report of the Legal Procedure Committee on the recommendations of the General Council of the Bar as to the conduct of civil business in the Queen's Bench Division. Adopted by the Council, the 21st of January, 1898:

The committee have had under their consideration the letter from the General Council of the Bar, dated the 5th of August, 1897, which was referred to them by the Council on the 29th of October, 1897, and the report of the Bar Council on the conduct of the civil business in the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice in London and on circuit. Shortly stated, the allegations of the Bar Council against the procedure in the Queen's Bench Division are:—1. Want of method, certainty, and continuity in the constitution and procedure of the courts. 2. That during the time of circuit the courts open in London are inadequate to deal with the business. 3. That the present circuit system is defective. The Bar Council arrived at the following conclusions:—1. That the great concentration of business in London renders it necessary that *at least* six courts should sit *continuously* in London throughout the legal year for the trial of actions in the Queen's Bench Division. 2. That it is desirable that arrangements should be made in the Queen's Bench Division for the further grouping of actions in separate lists, each of such lists to be assigned either to a single judge, as in the Chancery Division, or to a small rota of judges, as in the Probate Divorce and Admiralty Division, and as at present done in the Queen's Bench Division with regard to the Commercial List; and that in making such arrangements the object should be to secure as far as possible that each action should throughout all its stages be dealt with by the same judge. 3. That, in order to carry into effect the improvements above recommended, an addition to the number of judges of the Queen's Bench Division is imperatively required. 4. That, until additional judges are appointed to the Queen's Bench Division, commissioners should, when occasion arises, be appointed to go circuit, so as to enable the above recommendations to be carried out. The committee agree with the allegations contained in the report of the Bar Council. They consider that unless some reforms such as are indicated in that report are effected, the regular tribunals of the country for the trial of civil causes will continue to be avoided or neglected, and that there will be an increasing tendency in the community to resort to more or less informal arbitration for the settlement of disputes, not only in commercial business, but in other and more general matters, in order to avoid the delay, expense, uncertainty, and other difficulties inevitable under the existing procedure of the Queen's Bench Division.

The committee desire to make the following observations and suggestions on the conclusions of the Bar Council, taken in order:

As to No. 1.—They agree that it is necessary that a number of courts adequate to deal with the concentration of business in London should sit continuously throughout the legal year, but they are not prepared to say what this number should be. They are convinced that there always is and must be increasing business in London, and that it is essential that adequate measures should be taken to cope with such increase.

As to No. 2.—They strongly support the conclusion that arrangements should be made for the grouping of actions of a similar character in suitable lists, but they desire to add that, in their opinion, no reform will be satisfactory which does not radically attack the difficulties which at present hamper all parties to a cause. Among these difficulties they wish to lay particular stress on the delay and uncertainty as to the date of the hearing, and further, on the uncertainty as to the court in which, and as to the judge before whom, any cause will be tried. In connection with this subject, the committee desire to refer to the report of the joint committee of the bar and of this society, dated June, 1888, and to the report dated the 27th of July, 1888, of the deputation to the judges thereon. These reports will be found to contain important recommendations as to the division and grouping of causes, arrangements for the dispatch of business during each sittings, the establishment of a special list for commercial causes, and other similar matters. Many of these recommendations have since been adopted, and your committee consider that the suggestions now made are an extension of those former recommendations following the same lines.

As to No. 3.—They consider that there should be an entire revision of the circuit system, but they agree that, so long as the present circuit system continues, an addition to the number of the judges of the Queen's Bench Division is imperatively required.

As to No. 4.—They consider that the appointment of commissioners to go on circuit is undesirable, and is, therefore, an unsatisfactory way of meeting the present difficulty.

Your committee submit the following suggestions: 1. That an official with practical experience of litigation should be appointed of the rank of a Master of the Supreme Court, who might be called "The Master of the Lists." It should be the duty of this master to arrange the cause lists of the Queen's Bench Division, under the direction of the Lord Chief Justice The committee point out that a recommendation of this kind is contained in the report of the joint committee, to which reference has already been made.

2. That this master should arrange the cause lists in groups, after consultation with the solicitors of the parties, keeping, so far as possible, causes of a like character in the same group; and it should be afterwards the duty of solicitors to communicate with the master as to developments occurring in the conduct of any cause such as settlement or adjournment by consent of parties, or the prospect of an extensive demand on the time of the court.

3. That each of these groups of causes should be assigned to a separate *rota* of judges of the Queen's Bench Division selected for each sittings only, so that the work of each of the judges of that division would, during each sittings, be directly connected with one or more of the groups into which the causes had been thus divided.

4. That particulars court rooms should be fixed in which the trials of each of such groups of causes should be conducted before one or other of the judges appointed on the *rota* for that group. By this means the court rooms in which actions of any particular kind were to be tried would be known beforehand, and the regular attendance of counsel would be secured, as is at present the case in the Chancery and Probate Divisions, but without the disadvantage of counsel continuously practising before the same judge.

5. That Divisional Courts should be altogether abolished.

LAW GUARANTEE AND TRUST SOCIETY (LIMITED).

The tenth annual general meeting of the Law Guarantee and Trust Society, Limited, was held at the offices of the society, 49, Chancery-lane, on Wednesday, Mr. John Hunter (chairman) presiding.

The report stated that during the year £79,691 15s. 6d. had been received for premiums, fees as trustees, and commission, which, after allowing £16,922 1s. 10d. for re-assurances, left £62,769 13s. 8d. The percentage of managing expenses was 30·97. In the last annual statement the reserve for claims in suspense and for rebates stood at £18,591 15s. 9d. This, by payment of claims and by rebates, had been reduced during the year to £14,505 17s. 2d. The directors had carried £10,146 7s. 2d. from revenue to this reserve, which now stood at £24,652 2s. 4d. The sum of £15,000 had also been added to the General Reserve Fund, which now stood at £70,000. The balance was £11,378 1s. 8d. From this £2,000 was paid as interim dividend for the half year ending June 30th, and the directors recommended that a further dividend of £4,000 should be paid in respect of the half year ending December 31st, 1897, free of income-tax, making the dividend for the year 6 per cent. per annum. This would leave £5,378 1s. 8d. to be carried forward. The item of "Properties in Hand" was increased by the expenditure on the old site of Her Majesty's Theatre, which the society took over two years ago. Since the last year's report Mr. Beerbohm Tree had opened Her Majesty's Theatre on part of the site, and the Carlton Hotel—now in course of erection on the remainder of the site—would be shortly roofed in. The directors had entered into contracts by which other substantial parties would complete, decorate, furnish and equip the hotel. They anticipated that before the next annual meeting this property will have been advantageously disposed of.

Mr. T. R. Ronald (general manager and secretary) having read the notice convening the meeting,

The Chairman, in moving the adoption of the report, said he thought he might well congratulate not only the shareholders, but also the assured in the Society on the amount of business the society had done during the year, and in the stability and usefulness of the society. The result of the year 1897 was contained in the revenue account. On the credit side there appeared the item of premiums. Last year the premiums and commissions together amounted to £66,000. This year the items had been separated, and they were £9,000 more than last year, and of that nearly £3,000 was under the head of commissions, which was pure profit to the society and did not involve it in any risk. For that reason it had been separated from the item premiums. They were earned chiefly by placing debentures and other securities which were guaranteed by the society, and for which they found a very considerable demand amongst their connections and friends in the profession. The item "Fees as Trustees" was now £4,213, against £3,800 last year. The trusteeships imposed a certain amount of trouble upon the directors and staff of the society, but practically they entailed no responsibility, and that was a very satisfactory item to find increasing. They consisted principally of trusteeships for debenture holders and issues of that description, but the society was obtaining a considerable amount of private trusteeships. The difficulty in connection with business of that class hitherto had been the impossibility of getting paid for it in existing trusts, but there was now a scheme under the Judicial Trustee Act of last year by which a trustee appointed under an old trust, might, if appointed by the court, be appointed on terms which would involve a proper remuneration for his services, and the society was quite willing to accept such appointment coupled with the remuneration which the court would provide. He thought it very probable that in that direction the society would before long obtain a considerable increase of income under that head. The reinsurances were £16,922 1s. 10d.; last year they were £16,500, and the net amount of the society's earnings was £62,700 as against £53,900, showing an increase of £9,000. The interest on investments, which included rents on property on hand, amounted to £5,900, being an increase of £1,500 on last year, and that notwithstanding the very large unproductive asset, the site of Her Majesty's Theatre. On the other side of the account were "Claims (including sums written off bank deposits and properties in hand during 1897)" £17,000, as against £19,000 odd last year. The expenses of the management, including commission, advertising, law charges, directors' and auditors' fees, and income tax were 30·97 per cent. upon the income. Last year they were 35·27 per cent. To cut the expenses down to 31 per cent. was a feat not accomplished by many fire insurance or other societies which had to look for perpetual competition in their endeavour to keep up their premium income. Whether that could be kept up for the future time would show. He would not be much surprised if the expenses went up to something like 35 per cent., a rate with which fire insurance offices were very well satisfied. The society had carried £10,000 to the credit of reserve, that was, claims in sight for which last year they had a provision of £18,000, and now, carrying the £10,000 to reserve, they had £24,000; so that, of that £18,000, something under £5,000 had been actually required. It showed, at all events, that the directors made a liberal provision for possible claims. They had carried £15,000 to the general reserve this year, as against £5,000 last year, and the directors recommended that the dividend should be made up to 6 per cent. for the year instead of 5 per cent. as it was last year, which meant that they would be able to carry £5,378 forward for next year, corresponding almost exactly with the sum carried forward last year—£5,359. The history of the society during the last ten years was recorded in the balance-sheets. On the credit side were the investments standing in the names of the trustees, who, he was sorry to say, had been reduced by the deaths of Sir Edward Kay and Baron Pollock. These investments remained at the figures which they originally cost. But he understood that at present prices they would realise nearly £8,000 in excess of the £110,000 there stated. "Australian Banks," which item was the severest storm the society had had to weather represented only £9,500 as assets, whilst last year they represented £11,600. They had now come down to a sum which the directors believed to be quite certain to be realised; but whether realised or not it was so moderate a sum that it would have no effect upon the business of the society. The "Properties in Hand" now stood at £262,000 gross, less the mortgages on them, £170,000, a balance in favour of the society of £92,000. That, of course, was an item which the directors would be very pleased to see diminish, and which they had every reason to hope before this time next year would be very substantially diminished. Of the gross £262,000, certainly three-fifths was represented by the site of Her Majesty's Theatre. Upon that the shareholders knew very well the society had guaranteed the amount of £120,000 at the time the ground had no building upon it at all. When the question came on two or three years ago it was a question of losing £120,000 or determining to build themselves, because the Crown authorities, to whom the freehold belonged, said if they were to extend the time of building they must have some definite person by whom the building would be put up. A great deal of consideration at the Board resulted in the directors making up their minds to carry out the covenant. That was communicated to the shareholders two years ago. They were very rapidly approaching the completion of the part of the business they undertook, and within three or four months, probably, they would be in a position to ask the Crown to grant them, or their nominee, the lease, to obtain which required a preliminary expenditure of £150,000, or something of that sort. When they got the lease the probability was that the property would be sold before long; at all events, the society would then have a valuable property to sell, instead of what it had three years ago—a very heavy burden to get rid of. The Government required, before they would give the society an extension of time, a cash deposit of £25,000 as a guarantee that the building would be put up. Before the 31st of December they returned £20,000, and the progress since made had justified them in returning the further £5,000, which the directors received a few days ago. On the other side of the account was the bank loan—£14,000. Last year it was £22,000. The

"General Reserve" was £70,000, as against £55,000. The "Reserve of Claims" was £24,000, as against £18,000, The "Revenue Account" was £9,378, as against £8,359—rather more than £1,000 more than last year. A dividend of 6 per cent., free of income tax, such as was proposed, was really £6 4s. or £6 4s. 6d. They now had over £70,000 income. The society had paid claims or taken over securities which they had guaranteed to the amount of more than half a million; so that he thought not only the shareholders might be well satisfied with the progress of the society, but those who had done business with it might feel that the society had filled a place in which its utility had been very conspicuous, and of very great advantage to those who had dealt with it.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN (Mr. R. Pennington) seconded the motion.

Mr. PEAKE said he was a little disappointed with regard to the site of Her Majesty's Theatre. There had been a report that the property would be sold, and he was in hopes the chairman would have told them that a contract had been entered into to this effect. He was very much disappointed that the expectations seemed simply a hope. He asked how matters exactly stood.

Mr. H. R. WHITE asked what the society received for the Jubilee seats.

The CHAIRMAN said the site was in the possession of the contractor at the time of the Jubilee procession, and the Board made an arrangement with him by which he was to get the profit of letting the seats, and the society was to get the benefit of a sum which was agreed upon as against the contract for putting up the building. As to Her Majesty's Theatre, the Board had been in negotiation with several people, and they thought it was not fair to make public what had taken place. This time last year the society stood in the position of having signed a contract to put the roof on the building at a cost of something over £100,000. To-day the board were within two storeys of getting the roof on. They had paid about half the amount to be paid under the contract, and they saw no difficulty in providing the other half when the work was done. The remaining work that would have to be done after the society had obtained the lease was the subject of an arrangement between the Board and other people. As to the terms of that, he did not feel himself at liberty to divulge them to-day; but he might say that they involved the society in but small pecuniary liability, and that there need be no cause whatever for anxiety on the part of the shareholders. He said, with every confidence, that before this time next year he had very little doubt indeed the society would have got rid of this asset from their books, and at a price which would be very satisfactory to everybody concerned.

The report was adopted, and a dividend declared, making the dividend for the year 6 per cent. free of income tax.

On the motion of the CHAIRMAN, seconded by the VICE-CHAIRMAN, the retiring directors—Mr. E. J. Bristow, Mr. J. E. Gray Hill, and Sir Joseph Sebag Montefiore—were re-elected.

Messrs. Deloitte, Dever, Griffiths, & Co. were re-elected auditors.

Mr. RUBINSTEIN proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman and Board, and the general manager and staff. Everyone present must be convinced that this was a most satisfactory report, and far in advance of anything the shareholders had anticipated. The chairman had made an observation that the society had been very heavily hit by the Australian banks; personally he (Mr. Rubinstein) thought the banks had proved a great advantage, because it had given people a confidence in the society they would not otherwise have had. The banks had brought about the collapse of other institutions but the society had borne the shock, which was the greatest possible proof of its strength. With regard to the Haymarket site, he happened to know something more than the ordinary shareholder, and he was satisfied that when the whole thing was worked out no loss whatever would be thrown upon the funds of the society. The directors deserved every possible credit for the masterly way in which they had dealt with that and other matters in connection with the society.

Mr. WALTER ASHTON seconded the motion, which was carried, and

The CHAIRMAN briefly responded.

UNITED LAW SOCIETY.

Feb. 14.—Mr. C. W. Williams in the chair.—The subject of debate, "That the existing prison system is urgently in need of reform," was moved by Mr. G. C. Ives. Mr. John O'Connor, ex-M.P., spoke to the motion, and the following members also spoke: Mr. Kains-Jackson, Mr. P. H. Edwards, Mr. A. W. Marks, Mr. Neville Tebbutt, Mr. Sells, Mr. Hubbard, and Mr. Forster-Boulton. Mr. Ives replied, and the motion was carried by four votes.

NEW ORDERS, &c.

TRANSFER OF ACTION.

ORDER OF COURT.

Monday, the 7th day of February, 1898.

I, Hardinge Stanley, Earl of Halsbury, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do hereby order that the action mentioned in the Schedule hereto be transferred to the Honourable Mr. Justice Wright.

SCHEDULE.

Mr. Justice KEKEWICH (1897—H.—No. 3,356).

In re Hubbard & Company, Limited James Martyr Hubbard v Hubbard & Company, Limited.

HALSBURY, C.

A petition has been circulated among the members of the Inner and Middle Temple addressed to the treasurers and masters of the bench of those inns, suggesting that an arrangement should be made for service to be held in the Temple Church on one day in each week during Lent at 5 p.m. The petition has been very largely signed; the first name on the list of signatures being that of Sir Richard Webster.

LEGAL NEWS.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. CHARLES ARNOLD WHITE, barrister-at-law, of the Inner Temple, has been appointed Advocate-General of Madras, in succession to the late Mr. James Henry Spring-Branson. Mr. White was educated at New College, Oxford, and was called to the bar in 1883. He was one of the editors of several editions of Wilson's Practice of the Supreme Court of Judicature and is a joint-editor of the Yearly County Court Practice.

Mr. FRANCIS WILLIAM LOWE, solicitor, of Birmingham, has been returned unopposed as Member of Parliament for the Edgbaston Division of Birmingham. Mr. Lowe is a son of Mr. William Lowe, who was also a solicitor of Birmingham. He was educated at King Edward's Grammar School, and matriculated at London University in 1871. He was admitted a solicitor in 1876, and joined his father in business, and is now head of the firm of Lowe & Jolly.

GENERAL.

The House of Lords recommenced its sittings for judicial business on the 10th inst. Their list contains 17 cases, of which 11 are from Scotland.

The *Globe* says that on Tuesday a litigant, when told he might sue *in formâ pauperis*, asked "In where, sir?"

Sir Albert Rollit, on the 11th inst., introduced a Bill to provide for the admission of solicitors of courts of British possessions to the Supreme Courts in the United Kingdom.

The members of the bar practising in the Admiralty Court have decided to present Mr. Justice Phillimore with a piece of plate in commemoration of his recent elevation to the Bench.

On the 10th inst., in the House of Lords, the Earl of Dudley presented a Bill for the amendment of the Companies Acts, and the Lord Chancellor presented a Bill to amend the law of evidence in criminal cases. The Bills were read a first time.

The members of the Western Circuit will entertain Mr. Justice Phillimore at a complimentary dinner, in celebration of his recent elevation to the bench, at the Hotel Métropole, on Wednesday, the 16th of March. Mr. Bucknill, Q.C., M.P., the leader of the circuit, will preside.

In arguing a point before a judge of the Supreme Court, says the *Central Law Journal*, Colonel Folk, of the mountain circuit in North Carolina, laid down a very doubtful proposition of law. The judge looked at him for a moment and queried: "Colonel Folk, do you think this is law!" The colonel gracefully bowed and replied: "Candour compels me to say that I do not, but I did not know how it would strike your honour." The judge deliberated a few minutes and gravely said: "That may not be contempt of court, but it is a close shave."

The Paris correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* says that a humorous incident occurred on Wednesday in the second Court of Assize, which was opened in order to deal with the cases delayed by the length of the Zola trial. No members of the public putting in an appearance, the president, M. Poupardin, sent to ask some of the persons awaiting admission to the Zola trial to enter his court, in order that the proceedings might be in conformity with the law. None, however, would risk the possible chance of failing to secure a place in M. Delegorgue's court, and in the end, to constitute the needed public, police officers in plain clothes were ordered into M. Poupardin's court.

In the House of Commons, on the 10th inst., Mr. Lloyd Morgan asked the Secretary for the Home Department whether his attention had been called to the judgment delivered by the Lord Chief Justice of England in the case of *Reg.* v. *Charles Rose*, in which his lordship referred to the question of magistrates not granting bail; and whether he would take steps to bring his lordship's remarks before the benches of magistrates in this country. Sir M. W. Ridley said: Yes, sir, I have read the judgment to which the hon. member refers, and most fully agree with the views expressed by the Lord Chief Justice as regards the principles which should determine the question of allowing bail. They are, in fact, the views to which the Home Office has often given expression. In a circular issued not very long ago to justices they were urged, in deciding questions concerning bail, to keep in view the importance of not imposing any imprisonment on an untried prisoner beyond what is absolutely necessary to secure his attendance at the trial. Everything that can be done by the Home Office to impress these views on magistrates has, as I think the hon. member will see, already been done.

In the House of Commons on Monday Mr. Gedge asked the Attorney-General whether, in view of the pledge given to the House on the 4th of August last that no step should be taken before the 1st of January, 1898, towards putting the provisions of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, into force with the express purpose of giving the right to prevent its operation in any county to the county council to be elected in March next, the Government would undertake that the notice given on the 26th of November last to the London County Council should not be acted upon. The Attorney-General said: I am informed that my hon. friend has already been in correspondence with the Lord Chancellor, and that the Lord Chancellor has informed him that, in the Lord Chancellor's opinion, there is nothing in the action of the Privy Council inconsistent with anything which I said last Session. I certainly had no intention of giving the right of veto to the new, more than to the old, county council. The course proposed by the hon. member is not possible, but I repeat that which the Lord Chancellor has already told the hon. member, that the Privy Council would

give most careful consideration to any representation made by the county council within three months from the 1st of January, 1898. Mr. Gedge said when opportunity presented he would bring this matter to the attention of the House.

On Saturday, at the Lewes Assizes, Mr. Justice Grantham, in the course of his charge to the grand jury, said that he wished to refer to one matter that had been mentioned in the Queen's Speech, and formed the subject of much controversy—namely, the proposal to extend to prisoners the right of giving evidence in their own behalf. No doubt the ordinary newspaper reader thought that a criminal trial was a very one-sided affair, in which the prosecution had the advantage of doing all the talking, while the mouth of the unfortunate prisoner was shut, so as to prevent his having a fair opportunity of putting his case before the jury. This was an entirely erroneous view. By statute the committing magistrates were bound to give a prisoner the opportunity of making his statement, which at the trial was read to the jury. In his experience, if the statement were a true one, the prisoner was invariably acquitted. In his judicial experience, and previously as chairman of quarter sessions, he had known of only one man being convicted whom he believed to be innocent, and that was in a case where the prisoner had the opportunity of giving evidence. The prisoner, however, chose to tell a number of obvious and palpable lies, with the result that the jury who tried the case did not believe his evidence. The prisoner was, however, subsequently released by the authorities, owing to certain facts as to the case having come to light. He did not believe that anyone was ever convicted unjustly for want of an opportunity of giving evidence, nor that an innocent man would be the more likely to be acquitted if he had the right to give evidence in his own behalf. As the law now stood, juries always gave a prisoner the benefit of any doubt they might feel as to his guilt, but once afford prisoners the right of giving evidence, juries would lose their sense of responsibility, and would treat criminal cases as though they were civil actions, and, instead of the *onus* of proof being on the prosecution, the prisoner would have to establish his innocence. In his judgment the giving of evidence by a prisoner would be far more prejudicial to the innocent than to the guilty.

At the auction held at the Mart on Tuesday, Mr. Joseph Stower, of 43, Chancery-lane, disposed of all the Leasehold Properties offered, situate at Kilburn, Wandsworth-common, Brixton, and Walham-green. The Freehold Residence, No. 1, The Close, Croydon, was not sold, and may now be negotiated for privately. Mr. John Jobson and Messrs. S. Hughes & Sons were the solicitors.

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

Rota of Registrars in Attendance on

Date.	Appeal Court No. 2.	Mr. Justice North.	Mr. Justice Stirling.
Monday, Feb. 21	Mr. Farmer	Mr. Beal	Mr. Rolt
Tuesday 22	King	Leach	Godfrey
Wednesday 23	Farmer	Beal	Rolt
Thursday 24	King	Leach	Godfrey
Friday 25	Farmer	Beal	Rolt
Saturday 26	King	Leach	Godfrey
	Mr. Justice Kekewich.	**Mr. Justice Romer.**	**Mr. Justice Byrne.**
Monday, Feb. 21	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Pugh
Tuesday 22	Carrington	Ward	Lavie
Wednesday 23	Jackson	Pemberton	Pugh
Thursday 24	Carrington	Ward	Lavie
Friday 25	Jackson	Pemberton	Pugh
Saturday 26	Carrington	Ward	Lavie

THE PROPERTY MART.

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

Feb. 22.—Messrs. W. W. Read & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Ground-rent of £300 per annum, secured upon imposing business premises in Lombard-street, with reversion to rack-rental in 36 years of the present rental value of £1,125 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Wood, Bigg, & Nash, London. (See advertisement, Feb 5, p. 4.)

Feb. 23.—Messrs. Douglas Young & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., three Freehold Residences at Balham; let at £80. Solicitor, W. R. J. Hickman, Esq., London; Freehold Ground-rents, amounting to £72 per annum, secured upon 19 houses at Ilford, of the rack-rental of £543. Solicitors, Messrs. J. N. Mason & Co., London; Old-fashioned House at Barnes, with sixteen rooms, let at £40 per annum; seven Freehold Houses at Penge, producing nearly £160 per annum; Freehold Residence at Penge, let at £35 per annum. (See advertisement, Feb. 12, p. 2.)

Feb. 24.—Messrs. J. A. & W. Tharp, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Shares and Debentures in the following Companies: Commercial Gas, Clacton-on-Sea Gas and Water, West Ham Gas, Patent Victoria Stone, Swan & Edgar, Maple & Co., Pavilion Theatre; Lea Bridge, Leyton, and Walthamstow Tramways; London General Omnibus, London Road Car, National Safe Deposit, East London Railway, Belle Steamers, Apollinaris and Johannis. (See advertisement, this week, p. 3.)

Feb. 25.—Messrs. Henry Chapman & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Ground-rent of £300 per annum, secured upon residential flats in South Kensington, the rack-rents are nearly £1,500. Solicitors, Messrs. Willett & Sandford, London; also the Short Lease of 49, Jermyn-street, producing £910 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Rutter & Marchant, of London. (See advertisement, Feb. 12, p. 3.)

Feb. 25.—Messrs. Green & Son, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., 32 Leasehold Dwelling-houses at Blackheath, let at £547 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Maude & Tunnicliffe, London. Also 2 Dwelling-houses at Brixton, let at £60 per annum; and a Freehold Ground-rent of £6 per annum, secured upon property in Brixton. Solicitor, H. C. Morris, Esq., London. (See advertisements, this week, p. 3.)

RESULT OF SALE.

At Messrs. H. E. Foster & Cranfield's Property Auction, at the Mart, E.C., on Wednesday last, the following properties were disposed of: No. 6, Shaftesbury-villas, Allen-street, Kensington, comprising a Private Residence, with Builder's Workshops in the rear; £750. Stoke Newington, 60, Fairholt-road, a Leasehold Residence of the annual value of £45, with possession; sold for £580. Freehold Ground-rents of £12 12s. per annum, secured upon Nos. 5, 7, 9, and 11, Park-mews, Kilburn-park-road, Kilburn; sold for £350.

Reversion, Life Policy, and Insurance Shares.

Messrs. H. E. Foster & Cranfield held their usual fortnightly sale of the above Interests at the Mart, E.C., on Thursday last, when a total of £10,195 was realized, among the Lots sold being the following:

		£
REVERSION: Absolute to one-third of £29,000; life 54	Sold	5,050
POLICY OF ASSURANCE: For £5,000; life 79	"	4,050
WESTMINSTER AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE ASSOCIATION: Twenty Shares of £50 each (£2 10s. paid)	"	495

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—Friday, Feb. 11.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Limited in Chancery.

Aylesbury and District Hotel Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before March 29, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Birch, Thame, Oxon, solor

Country Club, Limited (Horsham)—Creditors are required, on or before March 22, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Herbert Smith, 42, North st, Horsham

Crompton-Howell Electrical Storage Co, Limited (in Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before March 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Robert H. Marsh, Ethelburga House, Bishopsgate st Within

Epping Natural Mineral Water Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before March 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Arthur Burrell, 50, Carter st, Lorrimore sq. Hicks & Co, 13, Old Jewry chbrs, solors for liquidator

Hot Water Supply Syndicate, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before March 12, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Lawrence Robert Dickson, 48, Copthall avenue

National Company for the Distribution of Electricity by Secondary Generators, Limited (in Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before Tuesday, March 15, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to J H Thornton, 2, Warwick st, Regent st

Petrifite, Limited (Original Syndicate, incorporated 1895) (in Voluntary Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before March 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Harry E Warner, 21, Great Winchester st

Rockingham Railway and Jarrahdale Timber Co, Limited, of Melbourne, Victoria (in Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 19, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Whittingham, 4, Fenchurch bldgs

Wilson Malt Heating and Hot Air Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before March 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr Harold Mather, 10, Acresfield, Bolton. Dutton, Bolton, solor to liquidator

London Gazette.—Tuesday, Feb. 15.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Limited in Chancery.

Ambleside District Gas and Water Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before April 4, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. Thomas Mackereth, Ambleside. Bolton & Bolton, Kendal, solors to liquidator

Armadale Gold Mining Co, Limited—Petn for winding up, presented Feb 14, directed to be heard on Feb 23. Huxham & Rawlinson, 42, Bedford row, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Feb 22

Asiatic Produce Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before March 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Hugh Chapman, 25, Abchurch lane. Harwood & Stephenson, Lombard st, solors to liquidator

Boveril, Limited (Old Company, incorporated 2nd March, 1889)—Creditors are required, on or before March 22, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Lawson Johnston, William Brander, and Andrew Walker, 30, Farringdon st

Brownfield Guild Pottery Society (Limited)—Creditors are required, on or before April 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts, to Charles Ernest Bullock, Hanley. Paddock & Sons, Hanley, solors for liquidators

Electrical Traffic Syndicate, Limited (in Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before March 26, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Maurice Jenks, 6, Old Jewry

Metropolitan Tower Construction Co, Limited (in Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before March 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr Edwin Waterhouse, 44, Gresham st. Samuelson, 57, New Broad st, solor to liquidator

Mount Hepburn Gold Mine, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before March 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr John Whittaker, 1, St Helen's place. Travers Smith & Co, 4, Throgmorton avenue, solors

Oriental Palace of Varieties, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before March 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Sydney Cronk, 44, Lombard st. Gibbs & Co, 4, Eastcheap, solors to liquidators

Rand Consols, Limited (in Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before March 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Percy Lumley Ellis, 145 and 149, Winchester House, Old Broad st. Maxwell, Bishopsgate st Within, solor to liquidator

Senegal S Syndicate, Limited (in Liquidation)—Creditors are required, on or before March 28, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles Luff, 11, Old Broad st. Burn & Berridge, Old Broad st, solors to liquidator

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

Bury Cloggers' Friendly Society, Commercial Inn, Spring st, Bury, Lancaster. Feb 2

Walsall Wood New Benefit Society, Red Lion Inn, Walsall Wood, Stafford. Feb 2

CREDITORS' NOTICES.

UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Feb. 1.

JOHNSON, JAMES, Shipton House Farm, near Market Weighton, York, Farmer. March 3. Tigare Manure Co. v Johnson, Kekewich, J. Mills, Beverley

QUINN, THOMAS, St Alban's mansns, Kensington et gdns, Builder. March 1. Ransom v Mom, Stirling, J. Ward, King st, Cheapside

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette—TUESDAY, Feb. 8.

ARMSTRONG, MARGARET, Carlisle March 8 Sewell, Carlisle

BARFIELD, EMMA ANN, Leicester March 19 Owston & Co, Leicester

BARNES, JAMES, Northfield, Worcester March 14 Harper, Birmingham

BARRELL, CHARLES, Ipswich March 7 Kersey, Ipswich

BEAN, JOSEPH, North Walsham, Norfork, Clerk March 1 Wilkinson, North Walsham

BLEASE, STANLEY, Liverpool March 15 Payne & Frodsham, Liverpool

BOURNE, JAMES, Stoke, Devon March 29 Hooker & Co, Plymouth

BOURNE, JANE, Stoke, Devonport March 29 Hooker & Co, Plymouth

BROOKING, NICHOLAS, Southampton March 26 Rimer, Quality ct, Chancery lane

BUSHELL, GEORGE LORT, Narbeth, Pembroke, Maltster March 9 Roberts, Narberth

COCHRANE, SARAH, Bloomsbury st, Bedford sq March 20 Kinsey & Co, Bloomsbury pl

COUSINS, JOHN JAMES, Leeds March 12 Cousins & Cousins, Leeds

DONOVAN, ELIZABETH GEORGIANA, Gargrave, York March 12 Wright & Co, Skipton

GARDINER, HENRY LYNEDOCH, Richmond Park, Surrey, General March 28 Rhodes & Son, Skinners' Hall, Dowgate hill

GAYLEARD, ALFRED THOMAS, Bromley Feb 25 Dean, Gt Russell st

HAIGH, BENJAMIN, Halifax, Cab Proprietor March 26 Longbotham & Sons, Halifax

JENKS, HENRY, Stoke on Trent March 12 Cooper & Co, Newcastle, Staffs

JENKS, SARAH, Stoke on Trent March 12 Cooper & Co, Newcastle, Staffs

KERSEY, CHARLOTTE, Ipswich March 7 Kersey, Ipswich

LAMBERT, SARAH, Sowerby, York Feb 28 Noble, York

LINLEY, SARAH, Islington, March 11 Coventon, Gray's inn sq

MASTERMAN, GEORGE JOSEPH, Ashstead, Surrey March 10 Blyth & Co, Gresham house, Old Broad st

MENDOZA, ISAAC PERCY, Croydon March 21 Wild & Wild, Lawrence lane

MORTON, HENRY, Ilkley, York, Coal Merchant March 1 Robinson & Co, Bradford

PAUL, ELLEN ELIZA, Clare, Suffolk March 25 Horne & Co, Lincoln's inn fields

PORTER, HENRY, Medlar with Wesham, Lancs March 1 Gaulter, Kirkham

RICHARDSON, ELIZABETH, Worcester March 29 Thos & A E Mace, Chipping Norton

SCOTT, MARY, Newcastle upon Tyne March 4 Storey, Sunderland

SHEPHERD, ALICE SUSAN, Brighton March 1 Thomas Beard & Sons, Basinghall st

SIDES, WILLIAM LLOYD, Liverpool March 12 Glover, Liverpool

SPENCER, ISABELLA, Halifax March 4 Godfrey & Co, Halifax

STACEY, EDWARD, Plymouth March 7 Graham & Co, Launceston, Cornwall

STAKE, THOMAS, Halifax March 9 Longbotham & Sons, Halifax

THOMAS, SALOMON, Manchester, Commercial Traveller March 1 E Shippey & Jordan, Manchester

VALLEY, ELLEN, King st, Portman sq March 8 Radford & Frankland, Chancery lane

WALLIS, STEPHEN, Regent st Feb 28 W H Martin & Co, King st, Cheapside

WILLIAMS, DAVID, Idaho, U.S.A. March 8 Pearce, Swansea

WINSTANLEY, JAMES, Leigh, Farmer March 5 Dootson, Leigh

WISE, HENRY EDMUND, English Combe, Somerset, Carpenter March 25 Gill & Bush, Bath

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Feb. 11.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ARKENHEAD, ALFRED, Cardiff, Accountant Cardiff Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

ALLIN, SAMUEL SEALY, Garlick hill, Cannon st High Court Pet Jan 21 Ord Feb 8

ALLISON, CHARLES, Kirton, Lincs, Carpenter Boston Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

ARROWSMITH, JOHN, Adlington, Lancs, Mechanic Bolton Pet Jan 28 Ord Feb 9

ASKEW, THOMAS, Oxenholme, Westmorland, Licensed Victualler Kendal Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

BARRETT, FRANCIS JOHN, Frampton on Severn, Glos, Joiner Newport, Mon Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

BIVEN, WILLIAM JAMES, Bristol, Leather Merchant Bristol Pet Jan 27 Ord Feb 8

BLADES, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Joiner Sheffield Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

BLYTH, HARRY COLEMAN, Buxted, Sussex Lewes Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

BOALER, BERNARD, Walworth, Shopkeeper High Court Pet Jan 21 Ord Feb 8

BRAY, GEORGE CHARLES, Hereford, Grocer Hereford Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

BROADLEY, ROBERT, Accrington Blackburn Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

BRUNTON, ARTHUR JOHN, Fakenham, Norfolk Boot Maker Norwich Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

BURROWS, THOMAS JAMES, Brynmawr, Brecons, Collier Tredegar Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

BUSBY, GEORGE, Birmingham, Builder Birmingham Pet Jan 17 Ord Feb 8

CHAMBERS, WILLIAM, Sutton in Ashfield, Notts, Joiner Nottingham Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

CLOUGH, JOSEPH, Castleton, nr Rochdale, Tanner Rochdale Pet Jan 25 Ord Feb 7

COCOMBE, GEORGE, Marwood, Devons, Farmer Barnstaple Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

DAVIES, WILLIAM, Penywain, nr Aberdare, Innkeeper Aberdare Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

DAWSON, JOHN, Bradford, Worsted Spinner Bradford Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

DE L'ISLE AND DUDLEY, Lord, Knightsbridge High Court Pet Nov 11 Ord Feb 8

DYALL, EDGAR THOMAS, Birkenhead, Bank Clerk Birkenhead Pet Jan 25 Ord Feb 9

EDMUNDS, CHARLES, Aberaman, Aberdare, Butcher Aberdare Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

ELLIOTT, JOHN JAMES, Bristol, Boot Dealer Bristol Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

FLOWERS, JAMES STEPHEN, New Swindon, Wilts, Hairdresser Swindon Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

GRAY, HARRY, Alresford, Hants, Corn Merchant Winchester Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

GREEN, JOHN GEORGE, Cheltenham, Dairy Farm Manager Cheltenham Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

GUBBINS, JOSEPH GARD, Staines, Draper Kingston, Surrey Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

HARPER, NOAH, Wolverhampton, Coachbuilder Wolverhampton Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

HITCHING, DANIEL, Parkstone, Dorset, Builder Poole Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

HUGHES, THOMAS, Mountain Ash, Glam, Confectioner Aberdare Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

HUXLEY, JAMES THOMAS, Old Kent rd, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

JAGO, JOSIAH, Sunderland, Medical Practitioner Sunderland Pet Jan 25 Ord Feb 7

JONES, JOHN, Mardy, Glam, Labourer Pontypridd Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

KIBBY, HENRY, Aberbeeg, Llanhilleth, Miller Newport, Mon Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

LEACH, HARRY, Leeds, Flock Dealer Leeds Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

LUMLEY, CHRISTOPHER, Quebec, Durham, Joiner Durham Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

MANN, THOMAS WILLIAM, Swinton, nr Rotherham, Glass Bottle Hand Sheffield Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

MASON, WILLIAM JAMES, Leytonstone, Provision Dealer High Court Pet Jan 22 Ord Feb 9

MORGAN, JOHN AARON, Bridgend, Builder Cardiff Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

OSBORNE, BENJAMIN JOHN, West Woodlands, nr Frome, Cattle Dealer Frome Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

PENNEY, ARTHUR PEARSON, Sydenham Greenwich Pet Jan 22 Ord Feb 8

POLLARD, FREDERICK ABRAHAM, Treforest, Glam, Licensed Victualler Pontypridd Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

PORTER, CHARLES, Long Eaton, Derbyshire, Farm Labourer Derby Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

PRICE, SAMUEL, Aberaman, Aberdare, Greengrocer Aberdare Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

PURDY, THOMAS, Clay Cross, Derby, Saddler Chesterfield Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

RICHARDS, ARTHUR EDWIN, Leicester Leicester Pet Jan 26 Ord Feb 8

ROBSON, ROBERT, Walmgate, York York Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

SCOTT, ROBERT, Eastney, Hants, Cab Proprietor Portsmouth Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

SPIVEY, FRANK WILSON, Luton, Bedford, Straw Plait Merchant Luton Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

STANSFIELD, JANE, Stubley Hall Farm, nr Rochdale, Farmer Rochdale Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

STOREY, JOSEPH, and JOHN STOREY, Bradford, Bakers Bradford Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

SWAIN, WILLIAM, St Leonards on Sea, Tailor Hastings Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

THOMAS, SAMUEL, Wrexham, Grocer Wrexham Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

THORNE, THOMAS WILLIAM, Gosport, Hants, Watchmaker Portsmouth Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

TURNER, ISAAC, Armley, Leeds, Coal Merchant Leeds Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

WATSON, JAMES, Doncaster Sheffield Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

WILSON, EDWARD, Bramley, Leeds, Commission Waste Puller Leeds Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

WOODWARD, JOHN, Worton, nr Isleworth, Market Gardener Brentford Pet Jan 11 Ord Feb 8

WRIGHT, WALTER WALKER, Burnley, Butcher Burnley Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

YABSLEY, GEORGE GARDENER, Salcombe, Devon, Builder Plymouth Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

FIRST MEETINGS.

AUSTIN, JOHN, Churchdown, Glos, Nursery Grower Feb 19 at 3 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester

BARLOW, JOHN JOSEPH, Alfreton, Derby, Foreman Labourer Feb 18 at 11 Off Rec, 40, St Mary's gate, Derby

BROOKS, ALFRED WILLIAM, and FREDERICK VINCENT BROOKS, Gate st, Lincoln's inn fields, Lithographers Feb 18 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

BUTLER, RICHARD, Southsea, Hants, Painter Feb 18 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge Junction, High st, Portsmouth

CHURCH, THOMAS, Peterborough, Hawker Feb 18 at 11.45 Law Courts, New rd, Peterborough

CLAXTON, ARTHUR ANDERSON, Bradford, Yarn Agent Feb 18 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford

CORBALLIS, JAMES FREDERICK JOSEPH, Farnham, Surrey Feb 18 at 12 24, Railway app, London Bridge

DANIEL, MATTHEW JAMES, Rotherfield, Sussex, Draper Feb 18 at 11 24, Railway app, London Bridge

DAVIES, JOHN, Llanegwad Feb 19 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

DIXON, GEORGE, Walterton rd, Harrow rd, China Merchant Feb 18 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

DUNNE, JOHN JOSEPH, Liverpool, Grocer Feb 23 at 12 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool

DUTTON, GEORGE WILLIAM, Chester, Grocer Feb 22 at 2.30 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester

EARL, JOHN, and CHARLES FRANCIS TAYLER, Kingskerswell, Devon, Brewers Feb 21 at 11 The Castle, Exeter

FROST, CHARLES MILTON, Toddington, Bedford, Surgeon Feb 21 at 11.30 Off Rec, St Paul's sq, Bedford

HANBURY & Co, Featherstone bldgs, High Holborn, Auctioneers Feb 18 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

HART, CHARLES CHAMBERS, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer Feb 18 at 12.30 County Court bldgs, Sheep st, Northampton

HOPKINSON, JOHN, Bradford Feb 18 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford

HUXLEY, JAMES THOMAS, Old Kent rd, Licensed Victualler Feb 18 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

KELSEY, JOHN, Stairfoot, nr Barnsley, Herbalist Feb 23 at 10.15 Off Rec, Regent st, Barnsley

KITCHEN, JOHN, Bradford, Builder Feb 21 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford

NYE, GEORGE THOMAS, Rochester, Builder Feb 23 at 11.30 115, High st, Rochester

PORTER, CHARLES, Long Eaton, Derbys, Farm Labourer Feb 18 at 11.30 Off Rec, 40, St Mary's gate, Derby

REED, ROBERT WADE, Wiston, Pembroke, Grocer Feb 19 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen

ROBSON, ROBERT, York Feb 22 at 12.15 28, Stonegate York

SELVEY, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Worcester, Dentist Feb 19 at 11.30 Off Rec, 45, Copenhagen st, Worcester

SPAVEN, MARY, Sneaton, nr Whitby Feb 23 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough

STEPHENS, GEORGE JOHN DIX, and JAMES HENRY HOUGHTON, Leeds, Clothiers Feb 21 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds

STURGESS, EDWARD, Nottingham, Labourer Feb 18 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham

THICK, CHARLES, Shepton Mallet, Fishmonger Feb 23 at 12 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol

TIBBETTS, THOMAS ADAMS, Cradley Heath, Staffs, Maltster Feb 18 at 11 Off Rec, Wolverhamton st, Dudley

TONKYN, ARTHUR, St Columb, Cornwall, Baker Feb 19 at 10 Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro

TRANT, WILLIAM EDWARDS, Kingswear, Devon, Baker Feb 18 at 11 Law Society's chmbrs, Athenæum lane, Plymouth

WHITESMITH, GEORGE, Scunthorpe, Lincs, Greengrocer Feb 18 at 11 Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Great Grimsby

WILLIAMS, GEORGE, Llandudno Feb 23 at 12 Prince Wales Hotel, Llandudno

ADJUDICATIONS.

ARKENHEAD, ALFRED, Cardiff, Accountant Cardiff Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

ALLISON, CHARLES, Kirton, Lincs, Carpenter Boston Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8

ASKEW, THOMAS, Oxenholme, Westmorland, Licensed Victualler Kendal Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

BLADES, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Joiner Sheffield Pet Feb Ord Feb 7

BRAY, GEORGE CHARLES, Hereford, Grocer Hereford Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7

BROADLEY, ROBERT, Accrington Blackburn Pet Feb Ord Feb 8

BRUNTON, ARTHUR JOHN, Fakenham, Norfolk, Boot Maker Norwich Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
BURROWS, THOMAS JAMES, Brynmawr, Brecconshire, Collier Tredegar Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 8
CHAMBERS, WILLIAM, Sutton in Ashfield, Notts, Joiner Nottingham Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
CROCOMBE, GEORGE, Marwood, Devon, Farmer Barnstaple Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 9
DAVIES, WILLIAM, Penywain, nr Aberdare, Innkeeper Aberdare Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
DAWSON, JOHN, Bradford, Worsted Spinner Bradford Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
EDMUNDS, CHARLES, Aberaman, Aberdare, Butcher Aberdare Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
FLOWERS, JAMES STEPHENS, New Swindon, Wilts, Hairdresser Swindon Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
GRAY, HARRY, Alresford, Hants, Corn Merchant Winchester Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
GREEN, JOHN GEORGE, Cheltenham, Dairy Farm Manager Cheltenham Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8
HANNETT, JOHN WILLIAM, West Bridgford, Notts, Timber Merchant Nottingham Pet Jan 17 Ord Feb 8
HARPER, NOAH, Wolverhampton, Coachbuilder Wolverhampton Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
HILL, GEORGE, Skipton, Yorks, Commission Weaver Bradford Pet Jan 3 Ord Feb 8
HUGHES, THOMAS, Mountain Ash, Glams, Confectioner Aberdare Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
HUXLEY, JAMES THOMAS, Old Kent rd, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 9
JONES, JOHN, Mardy, Glam, Labourer Pontypridd Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
KIRBY, HENRY, Abertrstruth, Mon, Miller Newport, Mon Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
LEACH, HARRY, Leeds, Flock Dealer Leeds Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
MANN, THOMAS WILLIAM, Swinton, nr Rotherham, Glass Bottle Hand Sheffield Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8
MORGAN, JOHN AARON, Bridgend, Builder Cardiff Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
NASH, WILLIAM JOHN, Waltham Cross, Hertford, Licensed Victualler Edmonton Pet Dec 20 Ord Feb 7
OSBORNE, BENJAMIN JOHN, West Woodlands, nr Frome, Cattle Dealer Frome Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 9
POLLARD, FREDERICK ABRAHAM, Treforest, Glam, Licensed Victualler Pontypridd Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
PORTER, CHARLES, Long Eaton, Derbys, Farm Labourer Derby Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
PRICE, SAMUEL, Aberaman, Aberdare, Greengrocer Aberdare Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
PURDY, THOMAS, Clay Cross, Derby, Saddler Chesterfield Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8
ROBSON, ROBERT, Walmgate, York York Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
ROESSLER, FREDERICK HENRY, Stratford, Essex, Cork Merchant High Court Pet Dec 14 Ord Feb 8
SCOTT, ROBERT, Eastney, Hants, Cab Proprietor Portsmouth Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
SPAVEN, MARY, Sneaton, nr Whitby, York Stockton on Tees Pet Jan 8 Ord Feb 7
STANSFIELD, JANE, Stubley Hall Farm, nr Rochdale, Farmer Rochdale Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8
STOREY, JOSEPH, and JOHN STOREY, Bradford, Bakers Bradford Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
SWAIN, WILLIAM, Hastings, Tailor Hastings Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8
THOMAS, SAMUEL, Wrexham, Grocer Wrexham Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
THORNE, THOMAS WILLIAM, Gosport, Watchmaker Portsmouth Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
TRANT, WILLIAM EDWARD, Kingswear, Devon, Baker Plymouth Pet Jan 20 Ord Feb 8
TURNER, ISAAC, Leeds, Coal Merchant Leeds Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
WATSON, JAMES, Doncaster Sheffield Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8
WATT, GEORGE MUTRER, Shincliffe, Durham, Printer Durham Pet Jan 20 Ord Feb 2
WESTLEY, J. H., Mrs., South Hackney, Boot Manufacturer High Court Pet Dec 23 Ord Feb 7
WRIGHT, WALTER WALKER, Burnley, Butcher Burnley Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8
YABSLEY, GEORGE GARDENER, Salcombe, Devon, Builder Plymouth Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

GWYNNE, EDWIN F., Farnham, Surrey, Hotel Proprietor Guildford and Godalming Adjud Dec 29, 1894 Annul Feb 8, 1898

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Feb. 15.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BARNES, SAMUEL, Andover, Hants, House Agent Salisbury Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
BEAUMONT, JAMES, Old Lindley, nr Halifax, Farmer Halifax Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
BENTLEY, REGINALD, Acton Brentford Pet Dec 20 Ord Feb 11
BUTTERFIELD, WILLIAM, New Wortley, Leeds, Baker Leeds Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
CONIBERE, ALFRED, Leatherhead, Veterinary Surgeon Croydon Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
COOK, SYDNEY HERBERT, Clacton on Sea Colchester Pet Jan 18 Ord Feb 12
COX, EDWARD EDWIN, Redditch, Warehouseman Birmingham Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
CRABTREE, JOHN A, Cardiff, Provision Merchant Cardiff Pet Jan 27 Ord Feb 10
CROSS, THOMAS WILLIAM, Heanor, Derbys, Licensed Victualler Derby Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
CURRY, WILLIAM, Buxton, Butcher Stockport Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
DEAKIN, GEORGE, Wakefield, Draper Wakefield Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
DENTON, FLORENCE BEATRICE, Bradford Bradford Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
DOVEY, MARY, Stourbridge, Worcester, Licensed Victualler Stourbridge Ord Feb 9
EDMONDSON, JAMES EDWARD, Leeds, Grocer Leeds Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
EPTON, JOSEPH, Gt Grimsby, Labourer Gt Grimsby Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
FRANCIS, STEPHEN JOHN, Frome, Somerset, Fruiterer Frome Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
GARTSIDE, NEWLAND, Crewe, Restaurant Proprietor Hanley Pet Feb 8 Ord Feb 8
HODDAY, HENRY OSWALD, Bromyard, Hereford, Draper Worcester Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
JEPHCOTE, RUFUS, Belgrave, Leicester Leicester Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
JOHNSON, WILLIAM HARRY, Mountsorrel, Grocer Leicester Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
KNIGHT, HENRY WILLIAM, Chatham, Confectioner Rochester Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
LEWIS, JAMES, Charles st, Blackfriars rd, Milk Carrier High Court Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
LOVELL, ALFRED, St George, nr Bristol, Boot Manufacturer Bristol Pet Jan 22 Ord Feb 10
MCNAMEE, FRANCIS, Darlington Stockton on Tees Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
MANN, WILLIAM, Penzance, Cornwall, Coal Merchant Truro Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
MINTY, WILLIAM HERBERT, and WALTER HENRY SKINNER, Trowbridge, Builders Bath Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
MORGAN, GILDARS OWEN, Llandebie, Carmarthens, Cabinet Maker Carmarthen Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
MORPHET, ROBERT, and JOHN WILLIAM MORPHET, Earby, Yorks, Stone Merchants Bradford Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
PARTRIDGE, HENRY WILLIAM, Bedminster, Boot Dealer Bristol Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
PINCHBECK, GEORGE, Great Grimsby Great Grimsby Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
POWELL, JAMES, and JOHN SMITH, Ashington, Northumberland, Grocers Newcastle on Tyne Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
RICHARDSON, ROBERT, Bielby, Yorks, Farmer York Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
SANDERS, WILLIAM DAVIS, Cardiff, Grocer Cardiff Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
SEYD, JULIUS ARTHUR, Old Broad st, Clerk Wandsworth Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
SMITH, WALTER, Wellington, Hereford, Innkeeper Hereford Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
STACEY, WILLIAM GEORGE, Cardiff, Grocer Cardiff Pet Jan 24 Ord Feb 10
STRAHAN, R E, Southport, Commission Broker Liverpool Pet Dec 22 Ord Feb 10
THOMAS, JOHN, Gowerton, Lougher, Glam, Builder Carmarthen Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
TOOTH, ARTEMUS, Queen Victoria st, Picture Dealer High Court Pet Nov 29 Ord Feb 10
TURNER, JOHN, Heywood, Lancs, General Contractor Bolton Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
WALTERS, WILLIAM JOSEPH, Pimlico High Court Pet Jan 12 Ord Feb 10
WHEATLEY, WILLIAM ROBINSON, Gloucester, Piano Tuner Cheltenham Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
WINDSOR, ALFRED ERNEST, Stramshall, nr Uttoxeter, Confectioner Burton on Trent Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Dec. 14:

MARTIN, GEORGE HENRY, Twickenham Brentford Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 8

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Feb 11:

CLOUGH, JOSEPH, Castleton, nr Manchester, Tanner Rochdale Pet Jan 25 Ord Feb 7

FIRST MEETINGS.

ALLIN, SAMUEL SEALY, Garlick Hill, Cannon st Feb 22 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
ALLISON, CHARLES, Kirton, Lincs, Carpenter Feb 24 at 12.15 Off Rec, 4 & 6, West st, Boston
ARROWSMITH, JOHN, Adlington, Lancs, Mechanic Feb 23 at 11 16, Wood st, Bolton
ATCHERLEY, JOHN, Wellington, Salop Feb 24 at 11.30 Wright & Westhead, St Martin's pl, Stafford
BASS, WILLIAM HENRY, Darlington, Bricklayer Mar 2 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough
BEAUMONT, JAMES, Old Lindley, nr Halifax, Farmer Mar 1 at 11 Off Rec, Townhall chmbrs, Halifax
BIVEN, WILLIAM JAMES, Bristol, Leather Merchant Feb 23 at 12.30 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
BLYTH, HARRY COLEMAN, Buxted, Sussex Feb 22 at 3.15 17, High st, Lewes
BOALER, BERNARD, Walworth, Shopkeeper Feb 22 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
BRUNTON, ARTHUR JOHN, Fakenham, Norfolk, Boot Maker Feb 23 at 10.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
CALVERT, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Liverpool, Tailor Feb 23 at 2.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
CLARKE, THOMAS WILLIAM, Ludborough, Lincs, Draper Feb 22 at 12 Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Great Grimsby
COOPER, JOHN, Yeadon, nr Leeds, Shuttle Maker Feb 23 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
DE L'ISLE AND DUDLEY, Lord, Knightsbridge Feb 25 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
DIXON, WILLIAM HOLMES, South Shields March 1 at 11.30 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
ELLIOTT, JOHN JAMES, Bristol, Boot Dealer Feb 23 at 1 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
EVANS, JOHN, Pontypridd, Commission Agent Feb 24 at 12 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
FLOWERS, JAMES STEPHEN, New Swindon, Wilts, Hairdresser Feb 23 at 3 Off Rec, 46, Cricklade st, Swindon
FRANCIS, STEPHEN JOHN, Frome, Somersets, Fruiterer Feb 23 at 3 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
GEORGE, CHARLES ALBERT, Gt Yarmouth, Fisherman Feb 26 at 12 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
HAWORTH, JOHN ALFRED, Accrington, Grocer Feb 23 at 11 County Court house, Blackburn
JONES, RICHARD, Llanfynydd, Carmarthens Feb 22 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
JONES, WALTER ROBINSON, Aberdare, Grocer Feb 23 at 2 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
KNIGHT, HENRY WILLIAM, Chatham, Confectioner Feb 23 at 11 115, High st, Rochester
LEWIS, JAMES, Charles st, Blackfriars rd, Milk Carrier Feb 22 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
LEWIS, PAYCE, Blaenavon, Mon, Grocer Feb 23 at 12 Off Rec, Westgate chmbrs, Newport, Mon
LINEE, THOMAS CHARLES, Alfreton, Billposter Feb 22 at 12.30 Off Rec, 40, St Mary's gate, Derby
LOVELL, ALFRED, St George, nr Bristol, Boot Manufacturer Feb 23 at 3.30 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
LUMSDEN, JAMES, Gatesheard, Schoolmaster Feb 23 at 12 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
MASON, WILLIAM JAMES, Leytonstone, Provision Dealer Feb 22 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
OSBORNE, BENJAMIN JOHN, West Woodlands, nr Frome, Cattle Dealer Feb 23 at 12.15 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
PARTRIDGE, HENRY WILLIAM, Bedminster, Bristol, Boot Dealer Feb 23 at 3.45 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
PAYNE, JESSE, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler Feb 21 at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham
PURDY, THOMAS, Clay Cross, Derbys, Saddler Feb 22 at 12 Off Rec, 40, St Mary's gate, Derby
RICHARDS, ARTHUR EDWIN, Leicester Feb 22 at 12.30 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
RICHARDSON, ROBERT, Hayton, Yorks, Farmer Feb 23 at 12.15 Off Rec, 28, Stonegate, York
SIMCOX, BENJAMIN, West Bromwich, Dairyman Mar 4 at 2 County Court, West Bromwich
STOREY, JOSEPH, and JOHN STOREY, Bradford, Bakers Feb 24 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
SWAIN, WILLIAM, St Leonards on Sea, Tailor Feb 22 at 12.30 Young & Sons, Bank bldgs, Hastings
THOMAS, JAMES, Hafod, nr Pontypridd, Grocer Feb 22 at 12 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
TURNER, JOHN, Heywood, Lancs, General Contractor Feb 24 at 11 16, Wood st, Bolton
WATT, GEORGE MUTRER, Shincliffe, Durham, Printer Feb 22 at 12.30 Three Tuns Hotel, Durham
WILKES, WILLIAM HENRY GRIFFIN, Birmingham, Surgeon Feb 23 at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham
WOODWARD, JOHN, Worton, nr Isleworth, Market Gardener Feb 22 at 3 Off Rec, 95, Temple chmbrs, Temple av

ADJUDICATIONS.

ARROWSMITH, JOHN, Adlington, Lancs, Mechanic Bolton Pet Jan 27 Ord Feb 10
ASPELL, WILLIAM LAXTON, Leicester, Box Manufacturer Leicester Pet Jan 17 Ord Feb 11
BARNES, SAMUEL, Andover, Hants, House Agent Salisbury Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
BEAUMONT, JAMES, Old Lindley, Halifax, Farmer Halifax Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
BRADY, ESTHER, Leicester, Milk Dealer Leicester Pet Jan 20 Ord Feb 11
BUTTERFIELD, WILLIAM, New Wortley, Leeds, Baker Leeds Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
CALVERT, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Liverpool, Tailor Liverpool Pet Sept 20 Ord Feb 12
CLARKE, THOMAS WILLIAM, Ludborough, Lincs, Draper Gt Grimsby Pet Jan 13 Ord Feb 12
CLOUGH, JOSEPH, Castleton, nr Manchester, Tanner Rochdale Pet Jan 24 Ord Feb 10
COX, EDWARD EDWIN, Redditch, Warehouseman Birmingham Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
CROSS, THOMAS WILLIAM, Heanor, Derby, Licensed Victualler Derby Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 11
CURRY, WILLIAM, Buxton, Butcher Stockport Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
DEAKIN, GEORGE, Wakefield, Draper Wakefield Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
DENTON, FLORENCE BEATRICE, Bradford Bradford Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
DUNNE, JOHN JOSEPH, Liverpool, Grocer Liverpool Pet Jan 5 Ord Feb 10
EDMONDSON, JAMES EDWARD, Leeds, Grocer Leeds Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
EPTON, JOSEPH, Great Grimsby, Labourer Great Grimsby Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
FRANCIS, STEPHEN JOHN, Frome, Somersets, Fruiterer Frome Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
HALLORAN, JOHN, Bedminster, Boot Dealer Bristol Pet Jan 31 Ord Feb 10
HAWKSLEY, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Butcher Sheffield Pet Dec 30 Ord Feb 12
HODDAY, HENRY OSWALD, Bromyard, Hereford, Draper Worcester Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
ISWORTH, WILLIAM BERNARD, Brighton, Jeweller Brighton Pet Jan 14 Ord Feb 12
JEPHCOTE, RUFUS, Leicester Leicester Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
JOHNSON, WILLIAM HARRY, Mountsorrel, Grocer Leicester Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
KNIGHT, HENRY WILLIAM, Chatham, Confectioner Rochester Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
LEWIS, JAMES, Charles st, Blackfriars rd, Milk Carrier High Court Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
MCNAMEE, FRANCIS, Darlington Stockton on Tees Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
MANN, WILLIAM, Penzance, Cornwall, Coal Merchant Truro Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
MASON, WILLIAM JAMES, Leytonstone, Provision Dealer High Court Pet Jan 22 Ord Feb 10
MINTY, WILLIAM HERBERT, and WALTER HENRY SKINNER, Trowbridge, Builders Bath Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
MORGAN, GILDARS OWEN, Ammanford, Llandebie, Carmarthens, Cabinet maker Carmarthen Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
MORPHET, ROBERT, and JOHN WILLIAM MORPHET, Earby, Yorks, Stone Merchants Bradford Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
PAYNE, JESSE, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler Birmingham Pet Feb 3 Ord Feb 10
PINCHBECK, GEORGE, Gt Grimsby Gt Grimsby Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 7
POWELL, JAMES, and JOHN SMITH, Ashington, Northumberland, Grocers Newcastle on Tyne Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12

BIRNHAW, FREDERICK CHARLES, Aldermanbury, Commission Agent High Court Pet Dec 16 Ord Feb 10
RAY, ALFRED JAMES, West Norwood, Builder High Court Pet Dec 10 Ord Feb 9
RICHARDS, ARTHUR EDWIN, Leicester Leicester Pet Jan 25 Ord Feb 11
RICHARDSON, ROBERT, Bielby, Yorks, Farmer York Pet Feb 9 Ord Feb 9
ROBERTS, JAMES NASMYTH, Edward st, Hampstead rd, Bamboo Furniture Manufacturer High Court Pet Nov 18 Ord Feb 10
SMITH, WALTER, Wellington, Innkeeper Hereford Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
STACEY, WILLIAM GEORGE, Canton, Cardiff, Grocer Cardiff Pet Jan 26 Ord Feb 10
SUTHERST, THOMAS, Victoria st High Court Pet April 14 Ord Feb 11
TATTERSFIELD, JOSEPH SENIOR, Batley, York. Blanket Manufacturer Dewsbury Pet Jan 18 Ord Feb 3
THOMAS, JOHN, Loughor, Glam, Builder Carmarthen Pet Feb 11 Ord Feb 11
TOMKINS, JOHN, Walton on Thames, Bargeowner Kingston, Surrey Pet Jan 3 Ord Feb 12
VIALL, JOSEPH HENRY, North Shields, Commission Agent Newcastle on Tyne Pet Jan 29 Ord Feb 8
WHEATLEY, WILLIAM ROBINSON, Cheltenham, Piano Tuner Cheltenham Pet Feb 10 Ord Feb 10
WILDMAN, E, Hammersmith High Court Pet Dec 8 Ord Feb 10
WILKES, WILLIAM HENRY GRIFFIN, Birmingham, Surgeon Birmingham Pet Jan 27 Ord Feb 11
WILSON, EDWARD, Bramley, Leeds, Commission Waste Puller Leeds Pet Feb 7 Ord Feb 10
WINDSOR, ALFRED ERNEST, Stramshall, Uttoxeter, Confectioner Burton on Trent Pet Feb 12 Ord Feb 12
WOODWARD, JOHN, Worton, nr Isleworth, Market Gardener Brentford Pet Jan 11 Ord Feb 11

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.